DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 391 740 SO 025 863

AUTHOR Miller, Linda Karen
TITLE The Portrayal of Federal Intervention in Domestic Disorders in Selected U.S. History Textbooks.
PUB DATE May 91
NOTE 150p.; Ed.D. Dissertation, University of Virginia.
PUB TYPE Dissertations/Theses - Doctoral Dissertations (041) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Constitutional History; Content Analysis; Course Content; Dissent; *Federal Government; *Federalism; *Federal State Relationship; High Schools; Political Science; Secondary Education; State Government; *States Powers; Textbook Content; *Textbooks

ABSTRACT

This dissertation addresses how federalism is portrayed in high school U.S. history textbooks. The guiding questions of this study include: (1) How well do senior high school U.S. history textbooks portray federalism through description of domestic disorders? (2) When domestic disorders are included in these textbooks, how accurately are they presented? and (3) When domestic disorders are included, how much emphasis is given to each major event where the domestic disorder requires federal intervention? Five textbooks were selected based upon the highest number of volumes sold as well as those in use in Virginia. Fifteen selected domestic disorders were investigated for their inclusion in the texts. Basic findings focused on: (1) the explanations of the causes of the disorders; (2) explanations of the issues involved which legitimized the federal intervention; (3) explanation of the delegation of power between the federal and state authorities in determining federal intervention; (4) descriptions of any conflicts between the President and state authorities; and (5) description of the adjudication of the incident. The study concludes that the story of federalism is told only partially in high school U.S. history textbooks' portrayals of federal intervention in domestic disorders. (EH)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

SO

ED 391 740

THE PORTRAYAL OF FEDERAL INTERVENTION IN DOMESTIC DISORDERS IN SELECTED U.S. HISTORY TEXTBOOKS

A Dissertation

Presented to

the Faculty of the Curry School of Education

University of Virginia

Dr. Jerry Moore

In Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree

Doctor of Education

---

by

Linda Karen Miller

May 1991

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality

- Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Dr. Linda Karen Miller

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

SO 025 863

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

© Copyright by
Linda Karen Miller
All Rights Reserved
May 19, 1991

The problem under investigation in this study is how federalism is portrayed in senior high American history textbooks. Federalism has been frequently expressed or redefined in history when state and federal interests are in conflict. Most often the conflict results from domestic disorders. How domestic disorders are portrayed in American history textbooks provides insight into how teachers and students perceived the development of our national heritage.

Three major questions guided this study. (1) How well do senior high school American history textbooks portray federalism through description of domestic disorders? (2) When domestic disorders are included in these textbooks, how accurately are they presented? (3) When domestic disorders are included, how much emphasis is given to each major event where the domestic disorder requires federal intervention.

Over the last two hundred years, there has been numerous occurrences of domestic disorders. Measures have been taken by the executive, by Congress, and by the courts to suppress these disorders. It was the purpose of this study to see how well senior high school U.S. history textbooks describe the process of federal intervention in domestic disorders. Did the texts deal clearly with the motives, the causes, the issues, and the processes involved in the federal intervention? A series of subquestions guides analysis of each event covered in the textbooks.

1) Did the author explain the causes of the disorder which precipitated the need for the federal intervention?

2) Did the author explain the issues used to legitimize federal intervention?

3) Did the author explain the delegation of power between the federal and state authorities in determining the need for federal intervention?

4) Did the author describe conflicts between the president and state authorities regarding the federal intervention?

5) Did the author describe the adjudication of the incident?

Content analysis was the primary methodology used to complete this task. The coding unit for the content analysis was the passage describing each of the historical events selected for analysis. The rater recorded the frequency of the coverage for each disorder on a chart. Also included was a complete recording of the passages to each event in the textbook.

Dedicated To

U.S. Marshal Lee Koury

My friend,

mentor

and advocate.

CHAPTER ONE

THE PROBLEM

INTRODUCTION

Since colonial times, the question of military force and its domestic application has been a crucial issue in American history. This subject was given a great deal of debate in the Constitutional Convention of 1787. The ideas debated there had their foundation in the accumulated experience of the colonies. Part of their experience was a fear of military domination which made the framers cautious of yielding too much power to the central government. The fear that a standing army would usurp the sovereignty of the states or limit the liberties of the people, caused bitter debates in the Convention. Assembling in the shadow of Shay's Rebellion, one of the most complex subjects the Constitutional Convention had to consider was to provide for the common defense. One of the main concerns was over the power of Congress to enforce its laws by military force. The fear of one state being coerced by another was offset by the fear of domestic violence such as Shay's Rebellion in Massachusetts in 1786. It was that insurrection that left a lasting impression on the framers and caused them to put control of the military in the hands of the federal government.

The reported debates showed that the delegates engaged in heated debates over such topics as a standing army, congressional control of the military and federal protection against uncontrolled violence. There was agreement that there should be no standing army.[1] There was agreement on the need for a militia since the militia had fought and won a victory against England. A well organized militia provided the best guarantee of liberty.

---

[1] Congress, Senate, Federal Aid in Domestic Disturbances 1903-1922, report prepared under the Direction of the Secretary of War by the office of the Judge Advocate General by F.T. Wilson, 67th Congress: 2d sess., 1922, S. Doc. 263, 11.

Randolph of Virginia presented a series of fifteen resolutions looking to "the common defense, security of liberty and general welfare" of the people of the United States.[2] The result was a document authorizing the establishment of a standing army, giving Congress power over the state militia and guaranteeing states against domestic violence. Out of this debate Article 4, Section 4 of the Constitution was conceived. It read:

> The United States shall guarantee to every state in this Union a Republican form of government and shall protect each of them against invasion and on the application of the Legislature or the Executive (when the Legislature cannot be convened) against domestic violence...[3]

This article lay the ground work to suppress disturbances which prevented the execution of the laws of the United States. The President was made commander-in-chief of the army and navy and of the militia of the states when called into service.

It did not matter to the framers whether such domestic disturbances were great or small. If the civil government failed, then federal forces could be employed. Article 4, Section 4 of the Constitution authorized the president to use federal forces to suppress insurrections against state authority when the state legislature applied for aid. Both the U.S. Constitution and the states recognized the right and duty of the state to preserve its own order. On more than one occasion during the last two hundred years, states have called for federal assistance to suppress disorder for which its own power should have been sufficient.

---

[2] Ibid, 12.

[3] U.S. Constitution.

The Constitution referred by the Continental Congress for approval by the states on September 17, 1787, clearly contained provisions authorizing the use of military force in the enforcement of federal law. The Constitution limited the role of the military in civilian affairs, making the president the highest civilian official in the executive branch, Commander-in-Chief of the armed forces. Limiting military involvement in civilian affairs has a long tradition beginning with the Declaration of Independence.

Congress passed several statutes limiting the use of the military in enforcing the civil law. The first law delegating to the president power to intervene with military force in domestic disorders was passed by the Second U.S. Congress and it became law on May 2, 1792. The second section of the 1792 law covered the calling forth of the militia to execute the laws of the Union. It read:

> ...whenever the laws of the United States shall be opposed, or the execution therefore obstructed, in any state, by combinations too powerful to be suppressed by ordinary course of judicial proceedings or the powers vested in the marshals by this act, the same being notified to the President by an associate justice or the district judge, it shall be lawful for the President of the United States to call forth the militia of such state to suppress such combinations and to cause the laws to be duly executed...

The powers vested in the marshals were set forth in Sec. 9

> That the marshals of the several districts and their deputies, shall have the same powers, in executing the laws of the United States as sheriffs, and their deputies in the several

> states, have by law in executing the laws of their respective states.[4]

This law is the basis for the framework of the delegation of authority between civilian and military forces in the use of federal intervention in domestic disorders.

The Supreme Court also recognized constitutional limitations placed on military involvement in civilian affairs. The principal case, Ex parte Milligan, 4 Wall. 2 124 (1866), was a Civil War case where the Supreme Court held that military commissions had no authority to try civilians in States not engaged in rebellion and in which the civil courts were open.

The framers also determined that a republican form of government should be guaranteed by the United States. In leaving us the guarantee clause, the framers provided few specific guidelines for its application. They did make it clear, however, that the clause established federal supremacy over the states in all cases of domestic disorder. The "guarantee clause" was first invoked in the Whiskey Rebellion in 1794 and has been applied on numerous occasions since that time " to preserve a republican form of government." James Madison constructed a new definition of federalism through the Federalist Papers. He emphasized ways in which the powers of states were recognized in the structure of the new federal government. Madison argued that the Constitution was "in strictness neither a national nor a federal constitution but a composition of both."[5]

---

[4] Robert Coakley, The Role of Federal Military Forces in Domestic Disorder 1789-1879 (Washington, D.C.: Center of Military History Department of the Army, 1989), 21.

[5] Federalist #39 at 257.

Article 4, Section 4 of the Constitution, requires the federal government to protect as well as restore republican government to the states. This article places obligations on both national and state governments. These obligations define the essence of federalism and were the focus of this study.

It was the purpose of this study to examine how senior high school textbooks on American history portray the concept of federalism. Federalism is basic to the study of American government by high school students. Constitutional Convention discussions over whether the new government should have a strong national government or a strong state government divided the state delegates. Later the federalism debate was the cause for the formation of the first political parties.

Controversies about textbooks have raged for years. In recent years, much has been written about the poor quality of social studies and or history textbooks. Some critics have argued that the ignorance of school age children concerning important concepts in history and geography is the result of failed textbooks. What textbooks include or exclude and how that subject matter is presented, effects student's understanding of history. Diane Ravitch,[6] brought national attention to this issue when a national survey she conducted revealed ignorance of important knowledge by 17 year olds.

Textbooks are undoubtably part of the problem. They are considered authorities and in classrooms present a sequence of information and structure for teacher's lessons. Textbooks comprise 75-90% of the academic content classroom instruction, [7] To many teachers and most students, the textbook is assumed to be a source of accurate information.[8] Furthermore textbooks lack motivational material because they frequently avoid controversial topics and issues.

---

[6] Diane Ravitch and C.E. Finn, Jr., What Do Our 17 Tear Olds Know?, (New York: Harper and Row, 1987).

[7] Harriet Bernstein-Tyson, "Why Students Aren't Learning Much from Textbooks," Educational Leadership, November 1989, 14.

Another part of the textbook controversy is textbook selection. School leaders demand books that cover the established curriculum and comply with content on standardized achievement tests. Several criteria govern textbook adoption. These include readability, inclusion of content on minorities and women, breadth of content coverage and aesthetics.[9] These and other societal demands make the textbooks what they are.

There are several advocacy groups that seek to influence how states and school boards select textbooks. Since the 1960's, these pressure groups have been more varied in their desired goals for textbook selection. In most instances these groups have argued that important information has been omitted or underepresented from the texts. As a result, publishers have tried to redress these grievances (omissions) by giving minorities, women, and common citizens a more prominent place in American history.

Since American history textbooks chronicle our nation's past, their content has been of intense interest to educators and the lay public. Reviewers have found history textbooks to be blandly written, inaccurate and lacking vivid historical narratives which provoke students interest and which make history come alive. Gilbert Sewall found that American history textbooks were lacking in the description of the "exploits of heroes and villains." He criticized textbooks for not giving proper credit for human achievements and for not handling controversy.[10] Francis Fitzgerald, America Revised (1979), found textbooks to be bland, avoiding conflict, and failing to probe the source of problems. [11]

---

[8] Paul Gagnon, Democracy's Half-Told Story, (Washington: American Federation of Teachers, 1989), 12.

[9] Harriet Tyson-Berstein and Arthur Woodward, "Nineteenth Century Policies for 21st Century Practice: The Textbook Dilemma,"Educational Policy 3 (June 1989), 100.

The Bradley Commission on History in the Schools was created in 1987 in a response to widespread concern over the inadequacy both in quantity and in quality of the history taught in American classrooms. The Commission concluded that active and intelligent citizenship is an aim of education. It is history that conveys a sense of civic responsbility by graphic portrayals of virtue and courage .[12] Michael Kammen of the Bradley Commission, argued that the proper role of government and society and how it has changed over time is critical to an informed understanding of political culture in the United States.[13] He further stated it is important for students to understand how the system of justice evolved, how it worked in recent decades and how American attitudes toward justice have varied.

Paul Gagnon's study, an important stimulus for this study concluded that American history textbooks do a poor job in describing sacrifices essential for the development of democracy in the United States. He argued that the primary purpose of secondary school American history courses was to help students understand the essence of democracy and those events which have promoted or obstructed its development. In his study, Democracy's Half-Told Story (1988), Gagnon asked two questions which are important for this study:[14]

---

[10] Gilbert Sewall, "American History Textbooks Where Do We Go From Here?, Phi Delta Kappan (1988), 555.

[11] Gagnon, Democracy's Half-Told Story, 10.

[12] Kenneth T. Jackson, chair, Building a History Curriculum (Bradley Commission on History in the Schools: Educational Excellence Network, 1988), 5.

[13] Michael Kammen, "Values, Beliefs, Political Ideas and Institutions," History Matters (October 1989), 5.

(1) How effective are the textbooks in teaching about democracy?

(2) How helpful are textbooks in teaching the history of democracy, its values and institutions?

STATEMENT OF PROBLEM

The problem under investigation in this study is how federalism is portrayed in senior high American history textbooks. Federalism has been frequently expressed or redefined in history when state and federal interests are in conflict. Most often the conflict results from domestic disorders. How domestic disorders are portrayed in American history textbooks provides insight into how teachers and students perceive the development of our national heritage.

Three major questions guided this study. (1) How well do senior high school American history textbooks portray federalism through description of domestic disorders? (2) When domestic disorders are included in these textbooks, how accurately are they presented? (3) When domestic disorders are included, how much emphasis is given to each major event where the domestic disorder requires federal intervention.

Over the last two hundred years, there have been numerous occurrences of domestic disorders. Measures have been taken by the executive, by Congress, and by the courts to suppress these disorders. It was the purpose of this study to see how well senior high school U.S. history textbooks describe the process of federal intervention in domestic disorders. Did the texts deal clearly with the motives, the causes, the issues, and the processes involved in the federal intervention? A series of subquestions guided analysis of each event covered in the textbooks.

---

[14] Gagnon, Democracy's Half Told Story, 10.

1) Did the author explain the causes of the disorder which precipitated the need for the federal intervention?

2) Did the author explain the issues used to legitimize federal intervention?

3) Did the author explain the delegation of power between the federal and state authorities in determining the need for federal intervention?

4) Did the author describe conflicts between the president and state authorities regarding the federal intervention?

5) Did the author describe the adjudication of the incident?

DEFINITION OF TERMS

These political terms were defined to give guidance to the study. The context for defining republican form of government, domestic disorders and federalism are central to the study of American history.

A republican form of government provides justice and protects liberty. Madison defined a republic as a country in which laws are made and administered by representatives elected by the people. It is a government whose main purpose is to promote the common good or common welfare. In a republic all of the powers of the government are given to it by the people. Also, a republican government is a representative democracy.

The domestic disorders in this study is meant to describe incidents in which the presidents have been involved are divided into two categories. These two categories were established by the Constitution and early laws:

(1) Enforcement of federal law or authority against "combinations too powerful to be overcome by the ordinary course of judicial proceedings."

(2) Constitutional guarantee of "a Republican form of government" to the states.[15]

In the first type the president could act on his own initiative and in the second, only on the receipt of an application from the legislature of a state or the governor if the legislature was not in session. In both cases, the use of force depended on the discretion of the president.

Prior to the Civil War, the major instances of disorder were occasioned by opposition either to a state government or to the national government. Washington, Adams, and Jefferson were each faced with the task of upholding the federal laws by force of arms. The origin of the conflict was directed against the government. Since the reconstruction period, disorders necessitating federal intervention have involved groups against one another rather than against any unit of government. In the disorders since 1875 in which the presidents have intervened to enforce federal law, opposition to the statutes have been incidental to the main dispute.

Federalism is the system of dividing powers between the state and national governments. The states delegated to the national government powers that affected the nation as a whole. The states also shared some authority with the national government. To function effectively, both the national and state governments needed certain powers, such as the power to maintain law and order. This was a type of concurrent power. Madison said that the two ways to check tyranny, protect liberty and provide order were (1) federalism checks tyranny by dividing powers between a central government and a state government and (2) separation of powers among the branches of government prevents any person or group from having power to oppress others.[16]

---

[15] Coakley, Role of the Federal Military, 345.

IMPORTANCE OF THIS STUDY

History, though dealing with the past, is a window on the present and a guide to the future. History books are important to the lives and thoughts of future adults and to the future history of the country. As these future adults begin to make decisions, their actions will be in some measure directed by what they have learned in school about the history of the United States.

Government is charged with protecting rights and guaranteeing justice for all in society. How students learn to judge issues and to evaluate their importance from what they read in their textbooks is bound to influence their social attitude in both childhood and adulthood alike.[17] How textbooks treat federalism was judged to be an important concept to investigate.

Textbook critics have made comments on their studies which have great relevance for the importance of this study. Kammen argued that students must understand how the system of justice evolved and how it has worked in recent decades and how American attitudes toward justice have varied. The investigation of domestic disorders was a good example of how attitudes toward justice have varied from enforcing slavery in the Fugitive Slave Acts to the enforcement of just the opposite when the court ordered desegregation of schools. Ronald Evans suggested that in the teaching of history one must make connections to today's issues because if teachers don't, then students will continue to be ignorant of the past and the implications it holds for understanding contemporary problems.[18] According to Gagnon, citizens need to know what struggles had to be accepted, what sacrifices borne and what comforts given up to preserve freedom and justice.[19]

---

[16] John Patrick, Liberty and Order in Constitutional Government: Ideas and Issues in the Federalist Papers, (Richmond: Virginia:Jefferson Association, 1989), 19.

[17] Gerald Horne, Thinking and Rethinking U.S. History (New York: Council on Interracial Books for Children, 1988), 21.

---

[18] John O'Neill, "Social Studies: Changing a Course in a Field Adrift," Update, (November 1989), 21.

[19] Gagnon, Democracy's Half-Told Story, 42.

CHAPTER TWO

LITERATURE REVIEW

The purpose of this study was to examine how federalism is portrayed in American history textbooks. Three major questions guided the study. (1) How well do senior high school American history textbooks portray federalism through description of domestic disorders? (2) When domestic disorders are included in textbooks, how accurately are they presented? (3) When domestic disorders are included, how much emphasis is given to each major event where the domestic disorder requires federal intervention?

The literature review in this chapter divided into two sections describes relevant studies of social studies textbooks where researchers used content analysis to determine the portrayal of minority groups and women in American history. The second section describes legal studies illuminating domestic disorders in American history. These legal studies were vital in determining the accurate portrayal of domestic disorders and ultimately the concept of federalism.

RESEARCH ON SOCIAL STUDIES TEXTBOOKS

What becomes apparent from the research on textbooks is that there have been attempts to analyze the accuracy with which textbooks portray blacks, (Garcia, Turner 1973), women (Kirby 1981 and Tetreault 1984), and American Indians (O'Neill 1987). Other topics for textbook research include the white ethnic experience (Garcia 1986), religion (1987), and controversial issues (Kelly 1981). Still other studies have described techniques for the analysis of textbooks such as Garcia (1979), People for the American Way (1986), the NEA (1973) and the Council on Interracial Books for Children (1977). More generalized studies include the role of the textbooks on how the story of democracy is told. (Gagnon (1989), Sewall (1988) and Fitzgerald (1979). Researchers have used varied approaches in performing content analysis on targeted textbooks. Content analysis has been used to analyze the types of words historic or literary figures have used. Words a person uses and the frequency with which they have been used can reflect their personality. Such studies have been completed on among others, Woodrow Wilson, William James and Ralph Waldo Emerson. Other studies have been completed on the ordered word frequency lists in the Democratic and Republican National Party Platform 1976-80. Still other studies have focused on selected themes in Korean War Editorials in American mass and prestige newspapers.[20]

Content analysis has been used frequently to determine the treatment of selected groups in American history textbooks. For example Garcia, (1981, 1985, 1986) Turner (1973) and Kirby, (1981) used this technique to explain how targeted groups have been left out of American history. Garcia "The White Ethnic Experience in Selected U.S. History Textbooks," (1986) used content analysis to determine how Irish, Italian, Jewish, and Polish Americans were treated in secondary U.S. history textbooks. He analyzed sets of textbooks each chosen representing three different time periods; the ethnic studies period, 1956-75; the multi-cultural period 1977-78 and the contemporary period, 1984-86. Garcia concluded that white ethnic content was included in the first time period, that white ethnic content increased in the second time period, and that it continues to be included in the most recent time period.[21] Garcia used the index in each textbook to identify terms that applied to immigrant or immigration. When the entries were located all sentences describing immigrant groups were tabulated. In his study on "The Portrayal of Black Americans", (1985) Garcia scanned texts for sentences relating to the treatment of the black Americans. The sentences were categorized in terms of their relationship to questions developed in his previous study.[22] Garcia found that the textbook material on blacks was unevenly distributed. Most of the material focused on slavery, reconstruction, and the problems of freedmen and Civil Rights. Garcia discovered that the sentences per page on the black experience had increased in recent textbooks. The quantity and quality of the presentation had also improved, while important information continued to be omitted.

---

[20] John Garanty, Trends in Content Analysis, (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1959), 171.

Richard Turner (1973) examined American history textbooks in elementary grades for the period 1963-69 concerning the portrayal of black Americans. He concluded that there has been no substantial change in how the contributions of blacks have been reported in the textbooks. He wrote that although much had been written about Afro-American history, little had been done on how Afro-Americans are portrayed in the textbooks.[23] This study on federalism in American history textbooks included events that also involve the description of black Americans such as fugitive slaves, slavery, civil rights and desegregation cases.

---

[21] Jesus Garcia, "The White Ethnic Experience in Selected U.S. History Textbooks," Social Education, July/Aug. 1986, 172.

[22] Jesus Garcia, "The Portrayal of Black Americans in U.S. HIstory Textbooks," Social Studies, Sept./Oct.1981, 204.

[23] Richard Turner, "Black History in Selected American History Textbooks," Educational Leadership, Feb. 1973, 449.

David Kirby and Nancy Julian (1981) did a study on "The Treatment of Women in High School U.S. History Textbooks." Questions guiding their study included: (1) Who among outstanding individual women is noted in the texts and who is not? 2) Which women's topics are covered and which are omitted? (3) How are average women treated? 4) How are women who took stands on controversial issues treated? 5) What distortions, if any, appear in textbook coverage of women. [24] This study included junior and senior high school texts. Textbooks were selected by asking the fifty largest school districts in the United States for their social studies texts. A sample of ten textbooks provided data for their study. The researchers analyzed the textbooks using the following categories: equality of sexes; chivalrous view of sexes, sex role stereotyping and male supremist.[25] The researchers concluded that although many textbook passages presented significant material about women, most passages required editing or additional information in order to correctly portray the lives and roles of women in American history. Historical events which were focused directly on women were the most objective and balanced. Other events that did not have women's issues at the center were often misleading. They concluded that there still needs to be more equitable treatment of women in American history texts.

Michael Kelly and Richard Gross (1981) conducted a study of controversial issues in social studies textbooks. Their purpose was to determine how well balanced controversial issues were in social studies textbooks. Two questions provided the focus of the study: 1) Was a controversial topic presented in the social studies text? 2) Was the presentation balanced in that different advocacy positions were presented?"[26] Kelly concluded that controversial issues were presented in textbooks but that the presentation was so brief that they failed to provide a balanced presentation of the issue.

---

[24] Darrell Kirby and Nancy Julian, "Treatment of Women in High School U.S. History Textbooks," Social Studies, Sept./Oct. 1981, 204.

[25] Ibid, 206.

The portrayal of Native Americans in American history textbooks has been of interest to educators for more than 20 years. G. Patrick O'Neill (1987) summarized findings from many of these studies. The portrayal of the North American Indian in American history texts was distorted, denigrative, inaccurate, and incomplete. Indians were presented as hostile savages and bad guys in the content, and texts tended to focus on these negative aspects giving little attention to North American virtues. The status of the North American Indian in most history books has not substantially improved in the last 20 years.[27]

Others like Fitzgerald (1979), Gagnon (1989) and Sewall (1988) have focused on the untold story of democracy in their textbook analyses. Fitzgerald, America Revised, compared textbooks over several decades with particular emphasis given to those published in the 1950's and 1970's. She argued that history books of the 1950's reflected America as the greatest nation in the world, and a great nation that embodied democracy, freedom, and progress. She noted that more recent texts have changed their emphasis from the great nation sermon to more of an inquiry approach. Fitzgerald supported findings by other textbook critics that 17-18 year olds lack knowledge of history and she found that American history textbooks do not overcome this ignorance.

---

[26] Michael Kelly, "Controversy in Social Studies Textbooks," Social Education, March/April, 1981, 62.

[27] Patrick O'Neill, "The North American Indian in Contemporary and Social Studies Textbooks," Journal of American Indian Education, May 1987, 28.

Harriet Tyson-Bernstein (1979) criticized American history textbooks for lacking an overall coherence and for being skimpy on important topics. Two criteria that she used to determine a good textbook were that the texts should embrace controversy so that the students share in the defeats as well as the triumphs and that the facts ought to be accurate.[28] She noted that the portrayal of minorities in textbooks continued to be largely superficial.

The People for the American Way (1986) conducted a study of American history using the following categories as criteria to judge the content: authority, interpretation, significance, content, representation, perspective, and appropriateness. They found that high school American history texts were poorly constructed because: 1) readability formulas led to poorly written texts; 2) little coverage of Asian, Hispanic and American Indian contributions to American history; 3) a dull, bloodless narrative follows from efforts to reduce violence in textbooks; and 4) the treatment of religion and religious issues continues to be weak.[29]

This study used techniques from these past studies to develop the guiding questions and categories to determine how well senior high school American history textbooks portray federalism in the description of domestic disorders. Garcia and Turner looked at how well blacks were portrayed. Kirby and Julian looked at how well women were portrayed. O'Neill looked at how well Indians were portrayed. Another guiding question in the study concerned the accuracy of the portrayal. Kirby and Julian, Tyson-Bernstein and Kelly were also concerned with accuracy in their studies. Another guiding question dealt with the emphasis on each major event. Garcia, Kirby and Julian and Kelly were also concerned with emphasis. This study counted sentences for emphasis as Garcia did in his study. Categories for the study of federalism were developed after reviewing these studies. Garcia, Kirby and Julian used categories in the study for the treatment of women.

---

[28] Harriet Tyson-Berstein, A Conspiracy of Good Intentions (Washington, D.C.: Council for Basic Education, 1985), 14.

[29] Kathy Ketner, "New U.S. History Texts, Good News and Bad," Social Education (Jan 1986), 62.

The full story of America's textbook crisis has yet to be fully told. Many critics have told part of the story. This study extended that story.

RELATED LEGAL STUDIES

The legal studies reviewed for the study provided essential background for the analysis of federalism and domestic disorder events in American history. The studies reviewed were selected from a list of sources recommended by military and constitutional historians. These casebook and legal histories provided content responses for the five sub-questions posed in Chapter 1. Those questions were:

1) Did the author explain the causes of the disorder which precipitated the need for the federal intervention?

2) Did the author explain the issues used to legitimize federal intervention?

3) Did the author explain the delegation of power between the federal and state authorities in determining the need for federal intervention?

4) Did the author describe conflicts between the president and state authorities regarding the federal intervention?

5) Did the author describe the adjudication of the incident?

The most useful surveys of the implementation of federal intervention in domestic disorders included: Ed Berman, Labor Disputes and the Presidents, (1924), Bennet Rich, The Presidents and Civil Disorders, (1941), William Wiecek, The Guarantee Clause of the U.S. Constitution, Robert Coakley, The Role of the Federal Military Forces in Domestic Disorders 1789-1878, (1988) and Ted Calhoun, The Lawmen (1990). These major works supported by selected articles from legal journals. Only one dissertation has been completed on the topic, Federal Military Intervention in Civil Disturbances by M.S. Reichley (Georgetown 1939).

In his book on Labor Disputes and the Presidents (1924), Berman concluded that the pressure of public opinion caused the president to intervene in domestic disorders. Of course, there was the desire to perform his duty to protect and keep order as well. When the presidents did intervene in domestic disorders, the intervention took on several forms. These included the following activities to avert or end a disorder.

A. Friendly intervention. (This includes the discussions of the crisis to assess the need for federal forces.)

  - Investigation of issues.
  - Letters to both sides urging settlement
  - Letters to federal officials or arbitrators urging settlement.
  - Requesting or appointing federal or state officials to act as mediators.
  - Meeting contestants in conference.
  - Mediates, arbitrates, proposes
  - Securing changes in arbitration.
  - Publication of results of investigation made under the president's direction in order to influence public opinion and thus hasten settlement.
  - Publication of president's efforts at mediation.

B. Coercion

  - Securing the passage of a law making possible the end of a strike by enacting some of the demands of a participant.
  - Threatening investigation of one of the participants with regard to prices and profits.
  - Securing an injunction for the purpose of averting or ending a strike.
  - Instituting other court processes for the purpose of averting or ending a strike.
  - Using federal troops to end a strike [30]

The president and advisers consider the most effective way to handle any given domestic disorder. Factors such as the president's character and his theory of executive power and the character of his advisers determine the nature of federal intervention.

---

[30] Ed Berman, Labor Disputes and the Presidents, (New York: Columbia University Press, 1924), 249-51.

Rich's The Presidents and Civil Disorders (1941), provides a detailed account of the sources of presidential authority in domestic disorders, the procedures involved and the issues behind the call for federal intervention in domestic disorders. From this study, a category entitled "issues" was chosen for textbook analysis. When passages were analyzed for "issues" the following were used as criteria:

> 1) ENFORCEMENT OF FEDERAL LAW
> Appeals to the president come from the civil authorities of the United States rather than from state officials. At the time of the Whiskey Rebellion in 1794, judicial notification was needed before the president could call out the militia. The interpretation of the law was changed to make the president the sole determiner in the case of Martin v. Mott. Justice Story stated that the "authority to decide whether the emergency has risen belongs exclusively to the president and his decision is conclusive upon other persons." [31]
>
> 2) PRESERVATION OF CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS
> The president is given the power to determine whether by insurrection, domestic violence, or unlawful combinations or conspiracies, any portion or class of people of a state is being deprived of the "rights, privileges or immunities or protection, named in the Constitution and secured by its. laws."[32]
>
> 3) EMPLOY ARMED FORCES TO AID THE STATES.
> In case of insurrection in any state against the government, it shall be lawful for the president on application of the legislature of such State or of the executive when the legislature cannot be convened, to call forth such number of the militia of any other State or states which may be applied as he deems sufficient to suppress such insurrection or on like application, to employ for the same purposes such part of the land or naval forces of the United States as he deems necessary.[33]
>
> 4) LAWS BE FAITHFULLY EXECUTED
> Another basis for presidential action evolved from the Neagle case of 1889. This concluded that the president's duty to take care that the laws be faithfully executed "is not limited to the enforcement of acts of Congress or of statutes of the U.S. according to their expressed terms, but

---

[31] Bennet Rich, The President and Civil Disorders (Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institute, 1941), 197.

[32] Ibid., 199.

[33] Ibid., 251.

> included the rights, duties and obligations growing out of the Constitution itself."[34]

These four categories were used to classify passages describing each domestic disorder as an historical event. This provided conclusions about how well "issues" of the events were accurately portrayed.

Selected law journals were helpful. A computer search of Pentagon Library along with assistance from William Wooldridge who last researched civil disorders for the Pentagon in the 1970's provided a select list of journal articles. "Soldiers, Riots and Revolutions, The Law and History of Military Troops in Civil Disorders" by Engdahl (1971) was most frequently identified by Army historians as the most comprehensive and definitive study on civil disorders in the United States. Engdahl described 18th century precedents for the measurement of domestic disorders many of which are traceable to English traditions. He described events from early England through the American Revolution that described the basis for some of our legal principles. This included the Marshal of England being in charge of the king's military force. The Riot Act of 1714 provided that in the event of a riot, the sheriff or other civil magistrate should go to the scene and read a proclamation ordering the crowd to disperse.[35] As the states developed their constitutions every state ordained its chief executive to be commander-in-chief of its armed forces. This underscored the idea that the military would be under subordination to the civil power. To further support this idea, Lord Mansfield originated a new doctrine of soldiers serving not as soldiers but as a posse comitatus of citizens. The Mansfield Doctrine became law in England and the doctrine of "citizen soldiers" continues today.[36]

---

[34] Ibid., 201.

[35] David Engdahl, "Soldiers, Riots and Revolution: The Law and History of Military Troops in Civil Disorders," Iowa Law Review, 57 (October 1971): 16.

Engdahl went on to describe debates in the Constitutional Convention concerning the clause for securing a republican government and control of the military. He explained that the guarantee clause had two objectives: (1) to secure a republican government and (2) to suppress domestic insurrections[37]. The guarantee clause "to provide for calling forth the militia to execute the laws of the union suppress insurrections and repel invasion" passed without dissent.[38]

Engdahl further discussed the Enabling Act of 1792.[39] This statute explained the delegation of authority between the civil and the military in domestic disorders. It explained that if the marshals as the civilian authority were unable to execute the laws, then the militia could be called out as a military force. The Act of 1807 provided that the president could add the land and naval forces to suppress civil disorders.

Engdahl provides a clear analysis of the statute of 1861. The law of 1795 which had governed the president's use of militia for execution of federal laws had distinguished between rebellion and lesser forms of resistance to authority. According to the Statute of 1861, rebellion and other unlawful combinations were classified together broadening presidential authority. Another change provided that the president need not decide that ordinary civilians official could not execute the laws in order for executive action to occur. He only needed to decide that for them to do so was "impracticable". The language of the Statute of 1861 governs executive privilege essentially the same way in domestic disorders today. Thus this article provided the background on how founding fathers had defined the role of the military in federal intervention. This article was also helpful in determining which intervention in domestic disorders were acts of the executive, Congress or the judiciary.

---

[36] Ibid., 36.

[37] Ibid., 37.

[38] Ibid., 38, U.S. Constitution Article 4 Sec. 4.

[39] Coakley, Role of the Federal Military, 21.

"A comprehensive Study of the Use of Military Troops in Civil Disorders With Proposals for Legislative Reform" (1972) reviewed material from Engdahl's article and described in detail the provisions of statutes concerning civil disorders. In 1878 the U.S. Congress ordered an end to the practice of federal marshals employing military troops as civilians, as a posse comitatus, to aid in marshal duties subject to civilian law. Under the Posse Comitatus Act of 1878, the troops could no longer be called by a marshal to ride as a posse on the trail of outlaws.[40]

Another article, "Honored in the Breech, Presidential Authority to Execute the Laws with Military Force" (1973), provided an excellent outline of presidential authority to use military troops in domestic situations. This article defined both the issues section of the analysis chart by discussing enforcement of law and the process of the federal intervention including a proclamation. This article was good for the understanding of the delegation of power section. The author described a system of checks and balances concerning the president's power to execute laws with military force. The In re Neagle decision was cited whereby the Supreme Court upheld the action of a federal marshal in defending a Supreme Court justice from assault even though the assault was not then a federal crime.[41]

---

[40] "A Comprehensive Study of the Use of Military Troops in Civil Disorders with Proposals for Legislative Reform," University of Colorado Review 43(1972): 411.

The article detailed the process that the president follows in federal intervention. This article was good to help establish the issues of why the president intervenes such as to respond to requests for assistance from state governments, to enforce the laws of the United States, to protect the rights of persons within the states when state and federal laws are obstructed, and to protect federal property from destruction. The author gave examples of each of these cases. The Posse Comitatus Act was also explained. The article concluded with ideas for reform legislation.

In "Riot Control and the Use of Federal Troops"(1968), the author explained the difference between the constitutional and statutory provisions concerning domestic disorders. The author explained in detail the reasons for state requests for federal intervention and the specific requirements of a request. Further explanation was given for presidential action without a request as well as presidential action under the Fourteenth Amendment. The article was most useful for explaining the difference between the constitutional language and the statutory language. The Constitution requires the existence of domestic violence while the statute uses "insurrection."[42]

In a congressional report, Federal Aid in Domestic Disturbances by F.T. Wilson (1922), there was a comprehensive study of all disturbances since 1794. It gave detailed explanations of the causes for the intervention and the delegation of power involved. Many more disorders where included. This study was one of those used for the population of disorders. He also made the point that in a republican form of government the civil authority must be everywhere supreme. The federal troops like all other citizens must be subject and subordinant to the civil powers."[43] This study was used extensively for many aspects of the study.

---

[41] "Honored in the Breech: Presidential Authority to Execute the Laws with Military FOrce," 83 Yale Law Journal, 134.

[42] "Riot Control and the Use of Federal Troops," Harvard Law Review 81 (1968), 641.

In the only dissertation completed on the topic, M.S. Reichley (1939) gave the most comprehensive study. In an excellent appendix he included all the disturbances and which laws were violated that caused the intervention. He also had numbers of troops used. This was especially helpful understanding the causes, issues, conflicts, and delegation of power for each event before the 1940's.

All of the legal studies were used to help create the categories of causes, issues, power and conflicts. It was from these studies that the background causes and political conflicts were discovered.

---

[43] Wilson, Federal Aid in Domestic Disorder, 221.

CHAPTER THREE

METHODOLOGY

The purpose of the study was to examine how senior high school textbooks on American history portray the concept of federalism. Content analysis was the primary methodology used to complete this task. Several organizations have developed techniques for evaluating the content of textbooks. Two examples illuminate problems in using content analysis. The National Education Association developed a checklist for evaluating the content of U.S. history textbooks. In general they employed a checklist in response to the following questions:

(1) Deal with controversial issues and problems in proper perspective?

(2) Indicate how the struggle for power, controversy and disagreement over public policy took place?

(3) Provide opportunities for the students to examine the causes and consequences of civil disobedience or violence on the part of both the representatives of authority and those who disagree with them?[44]

The Council on Interracial Books for Children developed a technique for evaluating the content of textbooks. They examined stereotypes, distortions and omissions in U.S. history textbooks (1977). Their rating checklist included what they believed should be presented. The rater analyzed each textbook to determine whether each item on the checklist was satisfied. The checklist consisted of the following categories:

(1) Provided incorrect information
(2) Provided the information
(3) Failed to deal even with the historical period.
(4) Provided limited information

---

[44] NEA Checklist for Selection and Evaluating U.S. History Textbooks (Washington, D.C. NEA.1973), 10.

(5) Provided full information[45]

As in the cases above, content analysis depends upon careful selection of passages of text analysis and thoughtful categories for grouping data gleamed from the passages.

Content analysis is a research technique by which a person seeks to determine the content of written, recorded or published communication in an objective, systematic and quantitative way. The procedure requires six steps:[46]

1) Identify the universe of the content. (In this study domestic disorders in American history listed in Diagram B provide the universe of content to be analyzed.)

2) Obtain examples of content to be analyzed. (Five senior high American history textbooks were selected as the examples for this study.)

3) Identify the coding units. (The coding unit in this study refers to the full passage in each American history textbook used to describe all individual domestic disorders)

4) Specify a category system (In this study each passage describing a domestic disorder in American history was analyzed according to content classified as causes of the event, issues of the event, power struggles between levels of government, the nature of conflicts and how the event was adjudicated.

5) Apply the selected category system to the individual coding units. (The number of sentences describing each event were counted and recorded.)

---

[45] Jesus Garcia and David Armstrong, "Textbook Evaluation: A Simple Procedure for Identifying Treatment of Selected Groups," The Social Studies (Jan/Feb. 1979), 33.

[46] Robert Covert, "Content Analysis: Analysis of Work Samples and other Written Documents." (Charlottesville: UVA: 1971), 5-8.

CATEGORY SYSTEM

DIAGRAM A

AUTHOR: ....

TEXT: ....

EVENT SAMPLES	CAUSE	ISSUES	POWER	CONFLICTS	ADJUDICATION	SENTENCES# OF
WHISKEY REBELLION						
DORR REBELLION						
FUGITIVE SLAVE LAW						
BLEEDING KANSAS						
ENFORCEMENT ACTS						
1877 RR STRIKES						
PULLMAN STRIKE						
1902 COAL STRIKE						
1919 STEEL STRIKE						
BONUS MARCH						
YOUNGSTOWN STRIKE						
LITTLE ROCK						
FREEDOM RIDERS						
MEREDITH						
WOUNDED KNEE						

SPECIAL CODES

Y means that the event and category were described.

N means that the event and category were not described.

.... Means that the event was not covered.

Sentences refers to the number of sentences allotted to the events.

DIAGRAM B

POPULATION OF DOMESTIC DISORDERS

*Whiskey Rebellion 1794
Fries Rebellion 1799
Burr's Conspiracy 1805-1807
Embargo Troubles 1808
Negro Insurrections 1831
Nullification Crisis 1832
The Black Hawk War 1832
The Sabine Affair 1836
Intruders on Cherokee Lands 1833
Removal of the Cherokees 1838
The Patriot War 1837-1838
Iowa Boundary Line 1839
*The Dorr Rebellion 1842
*Fugitive Slave Law Cases
    The Boston Fugitve Slave Cases 1851
    The Anthony Burns Riots 1854
*Bleeding Kansas
    Disturbances in Kansas 1854-58
San Francisco California vigilance committee 1856
Mormon Rebellion 1857-58
Utah Expedition 1857
Disturbances at Provo Utah 1859
The Affair at Harper's Ferry 1859
The War of the Rebellion 1861-65
Riots in Norfolk, Virginia 1866
Memphis Tenn. Riots 1866
Fenian Invasion of Canada 1866
Riots in Mobile Alabama 1867
Riots in Franklin Tenn. 1867
Nashville Tenn. election 1867
Disorders in the Gulf States 1868
Lawlessness in Arkansas 1868
Riot at Millican, Texas 1868
Riot at Mobile Alabama 1869
*Enforcement Acts
    Ku-Klux Klan 1866-72
    Riot at Unionville South Carolina 1871
    Political Disturbances in Louisiana 1866-75
    Ku Klux Klan South Carolina 1871
    Political Disturbances in Arkansas 1874
    Political Disturbances in South Carolina 1876
    Election troubles in Florida and Louisiana 1876
*The Railroad Strikes of 1877
Disturbances in the Territories 1878-1894
    Lawlessness in New Mexico 1878
    Disorder in Hastings Nebraska 1879
    Indian outrages in Arizona 1882

- Disorders at Salt Lake 1885
- Chinese outrages 1885-1886
- Chinese outrages in Seattle
- Chinese outrages in New Mexico
- Promontory, Utah Disorders 1886
- Rioting at Coeur d'Alene mines, Idaho 1892
- Muncipal troubles, Denver Colorado 1894

*Pullman Railroad Strike of 1894
Ccaxey's Army 1894
Coeur d'Alene 1899
*Coal Strike 1902
Telluride Colorado Strike 1903
Earthquake Disaster San Francisco 1906
Ute Indian Disturbances Wyoming 1906
Goldfield Nevada Strike 1907
Railway Conductors Strike 1913
Colorado Coal Strike 1913-14
Railway Strike 1917
Shipbuilders Strike 1917
Western Union Strike 1918
*Steel Strike 1919
Miners Strike Butte Montana 1919
Race Riots Charleston, Washington, D.C and Omaha 1919
Coal Strike Charleston, Brownsville, Wyoming, Utah, Kansas, Washington, New Mexico, Louisiana 1919
*Bonus March of 1932
Civil Rights Violence
- *Little Rock 1957
- Little Rock 1958
- *Freedom Riders 1961
- *James Meredith 1962
- University of Alabama 1963
- Birmingham Riots 1963

Indian Affairs
- Alcatraz Seizure 1971
- Department of Interior Seizure 1972
- *Wounded Knee 1973

*Events selected as most likely to be portrayed in senior high American history textbooks.

6) Revise categories based on application. Following a review of the category system upon completion of the content analysis, no changes were made in the procedures.)

The content analysis was conducted for each senior high American history textbook for all potential domestic disorders. The coding unit for the content analysis was the passage describing each of the historical events selected for analysis. The rater recorded the frequency of the coverage for each disorder on a chart. (Diagram A)

Also included was a complete recording of the passages to each event in the textbook. The following procedures were used to extract data from each textbook describing a domestic disorder.

1) The rater turned to the index and table of contents of the senior high American history textbooks to determine if the domestic disorder was included.

2) The entire passage describing a domestic disorder was extracted. The source of the statement and the length of the passage was recorded.

3) Each passage describing a domestic disorder was analyzed to determine if it accurately described the causes of the event, Constitutional issues, concepts of delegated powers between state and federal authorities, political conflicts between state and federal authorities over intervention and how the case was adjudicated.

The criteria used to analyze the quality of the passage were: (1) Causes of domestic disorders that precipitated the need for federal intervention. (2) Constitutional issues arising in each use of federal intervention, the enforcement of federal law, preservation of constitutional rights and or preserving a republican form of government. (3) Delegation of power involved between the state and federal officers involved in the disorder. (4) Conflicts between state and federal authorities. (5) Adjudication arising out of each event.

Prior to application of the procedures in content analysis, the rater prepared a description of the causes, constitutional issues, power divisions between state and federal governments, conflicts between state and federal authorities and adjudication processes for each of the fifteen domestic disorders selected for analysis. The source for these descriptions were legal studies described earlier in Chapter 1.

The following paragraphs provide examples of these brief descriptions. Examples of the causes used as criteria were as follows:

> WHISKEY REBELLION. The farmers refused to pay the tax and attacked U.S. Marshal David Lennox when he served the court process on them.
>
> DORR REBELLION. Rhode Island was still operating under an old charter which put high property qualifications on the right to vote.
>
> WOUNDED KNEE. The Indians demanded that Tribal Chairman Richard Wilson be removed, that Agency Supt. Stanley Lyman be transferred, and that they meet and discuss the 1868 Laramie treaty with governmental officials.

When passages were rated for Constitutional issues several questions were considered. Did the text explain that federal intervention was needed to enforce federal law, or to preserve constitutional rights for any group of people deprived of them, or to preserve a republican form of government or to see that the laws be faithfully executed? Examples of issues as criteria were:

> WHISKEY REBELLION. Enforce federal tax laws.
>
> DORR REBELLION. Preserve a republican form of government.
>
> FUGITIVE SLAVE LAW. Enforcement of Fugitive Slave Law of 1850 and Constitutional guarantees concerning slave as property.

When passages were rated for the criteria conflicts, the textbook was examined for the political conflicts between state and federal authorities. These conflicts might have arisen because the state authorities did not want the federal intervention. This could be because they thought their police could handle the situation or in the desegregation cases, the state authorities were circumventing federal law.

> WHISKEY REBELLION. A conflict arose between Governor Mifflin of Pennsylvania who thought that local authorities could handle the situation. There was also a conflict between Secretary of State Randolph and President Washington because Randolph did not think that force was necessary.
>
> PULLMAN STRIKE OF 1894. The most famous conflict cccurred between Governor Altgeld and President Cleveland. The governor was very much against federal troops being sent.
>
> MEREDITH. Governor Barnett of Mississippi refused to follow court orders and allow Meredith to register at the University of Mississippi.

When the passages were rated for the criteria delegation of power, the textbook was examined for the step-by-step process necessary for federal intervention. This process was first explained in the Enabling Act of 1792 and has been modified only slightly through the statutes in recent years. The basic steps of the process are as follows: (1) The president receives notification from governor or judge that disorder exists. (2) The president is told that state authorities were incapable of preserving the peace. (3) The state legislature is not in session. (4) The legislature could not be convened in time to meet the emergency. (5) The appeal to the president was to protect the state against domestic violence. (6) The president orders a proclamation. (7) The president decides whether or not to send in federal forces. Thus there are specific duties that the state must perform and the federal government must perform before the federal intervention takes place.

FUGITIVE SLAVE LAW. The U.S. marshals return the fugitive slaves to their owners. When mobs arose to prevent this, federal troops were sent in to assist the marshals.

BLEEDING KANSAS. U.S. marshals serve writs on people who have broken federal laws.

LITTLE ROCK. President Eisenhower calls out the troops.

When passages were rated for the criteria adjudication, the textbook was examined for actual court cases that arose from the federal intervention. Some of these expanded and others limited the role of the president in federal intervention in domestic disorders. Examples of the cases were as follows.

WHISKEY REBELLION. U.S. v. Vigol 1795 or U.S.v.Mitchell 1795. These were the first treason trials in the federal courts and established the precedent that widespread opposition to the execution of a United States statute amounted to "levying war" against the United States.

DORR REBELLION. Luther v. Borden. A state of domestic insurrection constitutes a state of war. The court said that the president should decide about the intervention. (Martin v. Mott 1827--The president's proclamation that an exigency had arisen requiring military aid was conclusive.)

ENFORCEMENT ACTS. U.S. v. Harris Declared these acts to be unconstitutional because they were too broad (except for the Ku Klux Klan Act).

1894 PULLMAN STRIKE. In re Debs. This case explained that under the Constitution power over interstate commerce and transportation of the mails is vested in the national government and that the national government may prevent any unlawful interference therewith. It was proclaimed a broad interpretation of national sovereignty and supremacy of the federal government over the states.

TEXTBOOK SAMPLES

Senior high school American history textbooks selected as a sample for this study were in use in schools. They were chosen for several reasons. The population sample were leading sellers nationwide. The population of major U.S. history textbooks included the following:[47]

- Addison-Wesley
  United States History by D. King, M.Marvin, 1986.
- Ginn and Co.
  A History of the United States by Boorstin and Kelly, 1990.
- Glenco/McGraw
  Challenge of Freedom by Sobel, La Raus, Deleon, Morris.
- Globe Book Co.
  Exploring American History by Melvin Schwartz and John O"Connor.
- Heath and Co.
  The American Pageant by Bailey and Kennedy, 1991.
- Holt Rinehart and Winston
  Our Land Our Time by Conlin, 1987, 1991.
  Triumph of the American Nation by Todd and Curti 1991.
- McDougal Littel and Co.
  The Americans by Jordon and Winthrop, 1990.
- Merrill Publishing Co.
  American Tradition
- Prentice Hall
  The U.S. A History of the Republic by Davidson and Lytle, 1990.
- Scott Forseman and Co.
  Land of Promise by Berkin and Wood, 1990.

---

[47] Statement by John Lavacco, Vice President, Holt Rinehart and Winston (November 1990).

Three of the five American history textbooks sampled for this study were chosen because they were used by Gagnon in his study. These included the books by Boorstin, Todd and Curti, and Davidson. A fourth textbook was included because it was the most widely purchased book in Virginia. The fifth textbook to be analyzed was selected because it was the most widely used advanced placement text. The sample of senior high school American history textbooks included:

1. Boorstin, Daniel and Brooks M. Kelly,
   A History of the United States, Ginn and Co. 1986.[48]
2. Davidson, James West and Mark Lytle,
   The United States: A History of the Republic,
   Prentice Hall, 1981. [49]
3. Todd, Lew Paul and Merlle Curti,
   Triumph of the American Nation
   New York: Harcourt Brace and Jovanovich, 1986.[50]
4. Jordon, Winthrop, and Greenblatt, Miriam,
   The Americans, Evanston, Illinois: McDougal, Little and Co.,
   1985. [51]
5. Bailey, Thomas and Kennedy, David
   The American Pageant
   Lexington, Mass.: D.C. Heath and Co. 1983.

SELECTION OF SUBJECTS

The use of federal force, as limited by the provisions of the U.S. Constitution and by judicial restraints, was confined to cases that were of national crisis. Thus all such disorders should warrant inclusion in several senior high school American history textbooks. The sample of subjects (domestic disorders) analyzed were as listed in Diagram A: Whiskey Rebellion (1794), Dorr Rebellion (1842), Fugitive Slave Law (1850), Bleeding Kansas (1854-58), Enforcement Acts (1870), 1877 Railroad Strikes, Pullman Strike (1894), 1904 Coal Strike, 1919 Steel Strike, Youngstown Steel Strike (1948), Little Rock (1957), Freedom Riders (1961), Meredith (1962) and Wounded Knee (1973). These events were selected from a population of numerous domestic disorders over the past two hundred years, (see Diagram B.) The sample of domestic disorders was selected after extensive research at the National Archives, Department of Army Military History Archives, presidential libraries, discussions with U.S. marshals and military historians. The final sample of fifteen domestic disorders were selected for the following reasons:

---

[48] According to publisher's representative this is #1 seller.

[49] According to publisher's representative, this is #2 best seller.

[50] This book has declined recently as the #1 and now has 25% of the market share according to John Lavacco, Vice President, Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

[51] Janice Brewster, representative for McDougal, Littel and Co., refused to give out any information.

- They were of such national crisis that they would warrant mention in the textbooks.
- They represent different reasons for domestic disorders.
- They represent time periods in a two hundred year overview of domestic disturbances.
- There was an important adjudication arising from the incident which either limited or expanded the power of the executive in domestic disorders and thus set a precedent for the handling of later disturbances.
- They represented a different form of precept. Each branch of the government issues precepts.[52] Judicial precepts are those that dealt with desegregation, congressional precepts included the Enforcement Acts and Fugitive Slave Act and the presidential precepts include the Whiskey Rebellion.

---

[52] Frederick Calhoun, The Lawmen, (Washington, D.C.: Smithsonian, 1990). 15.

The justification for the selection of the fifteen events over others is as follows. The Whiskey Rebellion was chosen because it was the first time that the "guarantee clause" was invoked in response to a rebellion against national authority. Federal intervention was needed to enforce federal laws when western Pennsylvania farmers opposed a federal tax. President Washington sent out troops to suppress the insurrection caused by resistance to federal laws. The experience of the Whiskey Rebellion demonstrated the need for sanctioning military force to guarantee execution of federal laws. Thus the Whiskey Rebellion was the first major event in the evolution of federal responses to domestic disorders.

The event not selected representing this early time period was the Fries Rebellion. It took place five years after the Whiskey Rebellion. The problem was also taxation. To finance an increase in military expenses due to the worsening relations with France, President John Adams borrowed money and then levied a direct tax on land and slaves. While the circumstances were similar, the Whiskey Rebellion was selected because it was the earliest event setting the precedent.

The Dorr Rebellion was selected because it established precedents for intervention of action of later federal executives. President John Tyler confirmed the responsibility for deciding when to intervene in domestic disorders. A very important case followed this which confirmed the president's responsibilities and thus increased presidential powers. The president's caution in this case warned future presidents that their power was best used with restraint.

The Dorr Rebellion was selected over the Buckshot War of 1838. Here President Martin Van Buren used caution. The president explained that even though the disorder threatened the peace of Pennsylvania, it was not caused by opposition to the laws but from a political contest between different factions of the government. The president felt that his interference would have dangerous consequences for our republican institutions.

The necessity for federal intervention in the 1850's centered around either the slavery question or maintaining order in the territories. The Fugitive Slave Law was signed into law by President Millard Fillmore September 18, 1850. The law provided for commissioners to issue certificates for the return of fugitive slaves and for the U.S. marshals to see that fugitives were returned. The authority for the Fugitive Slave Law rested upon a single clause in the Constitution: "No person held to service or labor in one state, under the laws thereof, escaping into another, shall in consequence of any law or regulation therein, be discharged from such service or labor; but shall be delivered upon claim of the party to whom such service or labor may be due." (Article 4 Sec. 2 Clause 3)

The southerners saw the guarantee clause as an assurance of a slave society. They felt it obliged the federal government to use all the resources at its command to suppress slave uprisings that threatened the southern republican way. Thus, there were several incidents which erupted into domestic disorders that called for federal intervention in enforcing the Fugitive Slave Law which guaranteed the southerners their way of life. In 1850, federal troops did assist the U.S. marshal to prevent the rescue of a recaptured slave by a mob. They were also used in the case of Anthony Burns in Boston in May, 1854, and in the case of Thomas Sims in April 1851.

The nullification crisis in 1832-33 in South Carolina was not selected. President Jackson issued a proclamation to express his determination to execute the laws and to preserve the union. This was not selected because active federal intervention was not necessary. Jackson's firm stand stopped the need for federal force.

The Enforcement Acts were included because they were important to uphold the Constitutional rights of the newly freed blacks. In working out a policy of Reconstruction, the scope of the guarantee clause was greatly expanded. It had been seen as a means of abolishing slavery. Now it was seen as a means of recreating the union. The Enforcement Acts adopted in 1870-71 marked the Congressional response to violence. The first one forbade state officials to discriminate among voters on the basis of race and authorized the president to appoint election supervisors to bring to court anyone who prevented citizens from exercising their constitutional rights. A second act strengthened enforcement powers in large cities. The violence continued and in April, 1871, the Ku Klux Klan Act was passed. This made certain crimes punishable under federal law. These included conspiracy to deprive citizens from the right to vote, hold office, serve on juries, and enjoy the equal protection of the laws. The Enforcement Acts were included because they showed that federal intervention had achieved what local government could not in defeating the Klan and protecting the equal rights of all citizens.

Labor disputes were the cause for federal intervention in the late 1800's and continued into the early 1900's. The action of railroad companies in the summer of 1877 by reducing wages of employees 10% was the occasion for a serious conflict between the forces of labor and capital resulting in the most extensive domestic disturbance which the country had witnessed. Troops were sent to six states as well as others held in readiness. This event was chosen because it represented a textbook example of what should be done in domestic disorder procedure.

The Pullman Strike of 1894 was chosen over Coxey's Army because of the wide spread effect it had on the nation and because of the conflict which arose between the governor and the president. Also the court case In re Debs was important in the evolution of the president's power in domestic disorders because it justified the president's action.

The 1902 Coal Strike was chosen over the other strikes that took place during this time. It represented the first important instance on record in which a President of the United States took an active part in attempting to mediate a labor controversy.

There were also several strikes concerning labor disputes during 1913-1917 that were not selected. President Wilson was able to stop a strike between railway conductors and trainmen in 1913. This would be the first of many times that the president was able to stop a strike. This one was settled by the passage of an act of Congress. The Coal Strike of 1913-14 was a bitter one and President Wilson was unable to stop the strike. More strikes occurred during the war than at any previous period in history. However, President Wilson was able to deal with most of them through federal negotiations.

There were several racial domestic disorders that took place that also were not selected. These took place in Washington, D.C.; Omaha, Nebraska; and Gary Indiana. They were not of enough consequence to warrant national attention.

In 1932, President Hoover encountered thousands of needy veterans who were determined to force the immediate payment of the soldiers' bonuses. The veterans came to Washington to demand that Congress pay them. They seized trains in East St. Louis, Baltimore, and Cleveland. By refusing to obey the government's order and by defying district police, the marchers brought down upon themselves the U.S. Army.

The Youngstown Strike (1948) was chosen because it was the only one in the list that did not require troop action. Also a major court case which limited the role of the president in federal intervention in domestic disorders followed the incident.

Little Rock (1957) was chosen to represent the desegregation cases of the 1950's because it was the first time that federal troops were used to uphold the Brown v. Board decision. It would set the precedent for other cases. President John Kennedy reviewed the situation and was determined not to use troops as Eisenhower had.

The Freedom Riders incident was used because it represented the enforcement of integration of public facilities. It was the first time that "Kennedy federalism" was used. This meant that after talks did not work, marshals were sent instead of troops.

James Meredith was selected to represent the violence at the universities caused by the enforcement of desegregation over the violence in Alabama. It was the first time that Kennedy had to react to this type of situation.

Wounded Knee was selected to represent the domestic disorders representing Indian Affairs over the seizures at Alcatraz and the Department of Interior Seizure. The failure of these previous seizures led to the seizure at Wounded Knee. The Indians demanded all rights and property which they said had been guaranteed to them by treaties.

CHAPTER FOUR

ANALYSIS

The Constitution of the United States requires that the federal government protect the states against domestic violence which may be caused by insurrection against state governments, by insurrection against the federal government or by unlawful assemblages against the execution of its laws. The Constitution also requires that the federal government to guarantee a republican form of government in all states. The federal government is authorized to employ land and naval forces of the United States and the militia of the states to execute protection against domestic disorders. This study looked at how selected American history textbooks covered the portrayal of federal intervention in domestic disorders.

The problem under investigation in this study was focused on how the concept of federalism was portrayed in American history textbooks. The purpose of this study was to examine how well the U.S. American history textbooks described the process of federal intervention in domestic disorders. Did the texts deal clearly with motives, causes, issues and processes concerning the need for federal intervention? A series of subquestions were used to complete the textbook analysis.

1) Did the author explain the causes of the domestic disorder which precipitated the need for federal intervention?

2) Did the author explain the issues involved which legitimize the federal intervention?

3) Did the author explain the delegation of power between the federal and state authorities in determining federal intervention?

4) Did the author describe conflicts between federal and state authorities?

5) Did the author describe the adjudication of the incident?

This chapter presents an analysis of how each of the fifteen domestic disorders selected for study were presented in each of five high school American history textbooks. The first section presents a descriptive analysis of the five textbooks for each event. The second section presents this information on summary charts. This includes a chart for each author as well as summary charts on how all authors covered the events and categories. The complete passages for each author and event are included in Appendix

SECTION ONE

DATA ANALYSIS FOR DOMESTIC DISORDERS

WHISKEY REBELLION

All of the texts presented the Whiskey Rebellion as a protest inspired by Hamilton's fiscal program. The Pennsylvania farmers in the western areas who were described as "angry" and "freedom loving", upon whom Hamilton's excise tax fell with especial force refused to pay. This was defiance of federal authority. Washington took an army at Hamilton's urging to put down the rebellion and vindicated the supremacy of federal law. After the Philadelphia trial of the "rebels" the President pardoned the convicted.

The description of the causes varied. Boorstin was the only author who clearly stated that the issue was to maintain "a republican form of government." Jordon did say it was to enforce a federal law. Davidson said it showed the government's authority to act within a state.

Bailey gave the most complete account of the Whiskey Rebellion even though he did not describe the delegation of power that the U.S. marshals served the process for those who did not pay the excise tax.

He also used the early figures of the troops of 13,000 when there were actually 15,000.

The adjudication of the event was the first treason trial in the United States. Boorstin and Bailey were the only ones who described the trial. Neither explained the significance.

CAUSES

BAILEY:	He described that the farmers tarred and feathered revenue agents and brought collections to a halt. He was the only one who said that lives were lost.
BOORSTIN:	He explained that the farmer refused to pay when the marshals tried to collect it.
DAVIDSON:	He said that the farmers refused to pay the tax and tarred and feathered revenue agents.
JORDON:	He explained that the farmers beat up federal marshals.
TODD:	He explained the heavy burden of the tax on the farmers and the attack on the marshal.

ISSUES

BAILEY:	He explained in detail the federal law and the defiance of the distillers.
BOORSTIN:	He explained that the issue was a direct attack on the authority of the national government. He was the only one who said that Washington was maintaining a republican form of government.
DAVIDSON:	He explained that the defiance of the tax law threatened the stability of the new nation. He also explained that it demonstrated the government's authority to act within the borders of a state.
JORDON:	He said that the rebellion was an opportunity to enforce federal law without help from the states.
TODD:	He specifically stated that the federal marshals were trying to enforce federal law.

POWER

BAILEY:	He correctly said that President Washington called the militia but did not say that he issued a proclamation.
BOORSTIN:	He said that Washington called out the militia. He also explained that the delegation of power included the marshals.
DAVIDSON:	He said that Washington summoned a force of state militia.
JORDON:	He described the marshals but did not say anything about President Washington. He described Hamilton which implied that Hamilton called them up because Hamilton also accompanied the troops.
TODD:	He explained that at Hamilton's urging, President Washington called out the militia. He also explained the role of the marshals in enforcing the law.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

CONFLICTS

BAILEY: No conflicts were described during the rebellion. However, the political events after the rebellion were described as he explained that the foes of the federalists condemned the administration for its brutal display of force.

BOORSTIN: He explained the conflict between the state and federal authority when he said that the governor thought that the courts could handle the matter.

DAVIDSON: He correctly explained that the governor thought the state could handle the situation.

JORDON: No conflicts were described.

TODD: He correctly explained that the governor refused to call out the militia.

ADJUDICATION

BAILEY: He did explain that Washington pardoned the culprits but did not explain the trial or the significance.

BOORSTIN: He very clearly explained that they were convicted of treason but pardoned. There was no mention that this was the first treason trial.

JORDON: None

DAVIDSON: He said that Hamilton wanted to punish them but Washington pardoned them.

TODD None

FUGITIVE SLAVE ACT OF 1850

None of the authors described any slaves escapes and thus did not describe the need for federal intervention to put down the protests of people trying to help the escaped slaves. Bailey explained the causes and the issue of enforcing the federal statute. He did not explain that the marshals were given the primary responsibility for returning the slaves. He did explain the legal process behind the return and also the conflicts with the state authority. There was no allusion to the political conflicts that this bill was unconstitutional or that it was inconsistent with a republican form of government.

Davidson was the only one who really explained the Constitutional issue involved. He explained the legal proceedings, but did not describe any slave escapes. Davidson focused on ordinary citizens instead of U.S. marshals returning the slaves. Boorstin also focused on citizens assisting in the capture of the slaves. No judicial cases such as U.S. v. Prigg were described by any authors.

CAUSES

BAILEY	He explained in his typical flamboyant language about the "Bloodhound bill" stirring opposition and that fleeing slaves couldn't testify in their own behalf.
BOORSTIN:	He explained that in defiance of the act, Northerners helped slaves escape.
DAVIDSON:	He was the only one who explained both sides of the causes.
JORDON:	He explained that the law provided recovery of slaves that ran way to free states.

ISSUES

Bailey:	He explained that the issue was enforcing the new federal statute.
BOORSTIN:	He explained the issue of enforcing the federal act and guaranteeing protection and a fair trial to runaways.
DAVIDSON:	He was the only one who stated the issue from both sides and the only one who described that the Constitution permitted the southerners to hold slaves as property. The Northerners resented the provisions of the law.
JORDON:	He did not clearly explain the issue.

POWER

BAILEY:	He described the role of federal commissioners but did not explain that the marshals had the responsibility of returning the slaves.
BOORSTIN:	He incorrectly put the emphasis on state, city and citizens returning the slaves when the responsibility was on the federal marshals.
DAVIDSON:	He explained the power of the federal commissioner but did not explain the role of the federal marshals. In fact, he also put the emphasis on the citizens.
JORDON:	He correctly explained that the slave holders could demand assistance from federal marshals and then go to a federal judge.

CONFLICTS

BAILEY:	He gave a good explanation of the conflicts as he explained that Massachusetts made it a penal offense for any state official to enforce the new federal statute. As he explained that other states passed personal liberty laws which denied local jails to federal officials and hampered enforcement.
BOORSTIN:	He correctly explained that states passed personal liberty laws which forbade state officials to assist federal courts.
DAVIDSON:	No conflicts were explained.
JORDON:	No conflicts were explained.

ADJUDICATION

None of the authors described any cases.

ENFORCEMENT ACTS

Bailey, Davidson and Todd were the only ones who covered the Enforcement Acts. All of them gave a good explanation of the causes and the issues. Davidson and Todd explained the proper delegation of authority of the president calling out the troops but none described the role of the marshal in protecting the Blacks at the election places. None of them described the conflicts which arose over the calling of the troops and the Posse Comitatus Act which came about to correct these conflicts. None of them described the case of U.S. v. Harris which declared the Enforcement Acts unconstitutional except for the Ku Klux Klan Act. None of them explained that it was the success of the federal intervention that led to the break up of the Klan.

CAUSES

BAILEY	He explained that Congress was outraged by the night riding lawlessness and passed the Force Acts. (This term was actually a derogatory term put on the "Enforcement Acts" by the Democrats.)
DAVIDSON:	The causes were not clearly stated although by reading through the lines, one got the idea from "threat of violence."
TODD:	He specifically stated that Congress tried to end the lawlessness.

ISSUES:

BAILEY:	He very clearly stated that the white South was openly flouting the 14th and 15th Amendment and the disfranchisement of blacks was achieved by intimidation.
DAVIDSON:	He clearly stated that it was the enforcement of laws to help people vote.
TODD:	He explained that the laws provided for federal supervision of elections. (He did not say who had the responsibility for supervision.)

POWER

BAILEY:	He explained that the federal troops were brought in but did not explain that it was the U.S. marshals who were protecting the polling places.
DAVIDSON:	He explained that the president sent the federal troops to enforce the laws but did not say that the federal marshals were used to protect the polling places.
TODD:	He gave the most complete explanation as he said that the president used military forces to control secret societies, called upon state

militia and provided for federal supervision of elections (although he did not specifically state marshals doing this.)

CONFLICTS

None of the texts described any conflicts between state and federal authorities. The authors missed the opportunity to explain that many times federal deputy marshals were arrested by state authorities when they tried to serve process.

ADJUDICATION

None of the texts described any adjudication. They failed to bring out that the Supreme Court found the acts unconstitutional. The court denied the federal government the power to protect the individual rights of citizens from actions of other citizens.

BLEEDING KANSAS

Todd and Boorstin had the shortest account. Todd briefly described the sack of Lawrence and John Brown. He was the only one to describe that federal troops were brought in to restore order. None of the textbooks described the intensity of the violence and the rampant disregard for the law. None of them described the delegation of authority between state and federal officers. Marshals and territorial sheriffs accompanied troops. The military task was one of policing the territory. The use of the army in 1856 helped prevent a civil war and in the end guaranteed the triumph of the freestate cause.

CAUSES

BAILEY	He explained the battle between the competing governments--one free and one slave.
BOORSTIN:	He did not give a very detailed explanation but said that men were fighting each other over slavery.
DAVIDSON:	In great detail he explained the two competing governments.
JORDON:	He explained the competition between the pro-slave and the free soilers.
TODD:	He explained that northerners and southerners rushed into the territory fighting over slavery.

ISSUES

BAILEY:	He explained that Kansans had the choice between two governments although he did not use the term "popular sovereignty."
BOORSTIN:	The issue was not clearly stated of preserving a republican form of government although he said that there were two sides, slave and free soil.
DAVIDSON:	He explained about the competing governments and that it was a question of extending slavery to the territories.
JORDON:	Even though he described the two sides, he did not explain the issue of popular sovereignty or preserving a republican form of government.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TODD:	He did not clearly explain the issue except to say that there was fighting over slavery.

POWER:

BAILEY:	None
BOORSTIN:	None
DAVIDSON:	None
JORDON:	None
TODD:	He was the only one who explained that federal troops were brought in to restore order.

CONFLICTS

No conflicts between state and federal authorities were described although the pro-slavery sheriff sacking Lawrence was described by Boorstin.

ADJUDICATION:

None

1877 RAILROAD STRIKE

Only three authors described the 1877 Railroad Strike. Boorstin only gave it one sentence while Todd gave it two paragraphs and Jordon expanded it into five paragraphs or thirty sentences. Todd did not explain the background causes. He did explain that troops were sent in to protect property. His delegation of power was clear when he explained that President Hayes sent the troops in after state troops failed.

Jordon gave a very detailed account of the strike with a detailed explanation of the causes. He failed to clearly state the issue of why federal troops were sent. The delegation of power also was not clear. He did explain the conflicts between state and federal authority.

CAUSES

JORDON:	He explained in detail the background causes.
TODD:	He did not explain the causes.

ISSUES

JORDON:	He explained that railroad property was destroyed and troops were sent in.
TODD:	He explained that troops were sent in to protect property and restore order.

POWER

JORDON: There was no description of the president calling out the troops. However, he did describe that the governor requested the federal troops.

TODD: He correctly explained that the president called out the troops after the failure of state troops. This is the clearest description of delegation of power.

CONFLICTS

JORDON: He explained that the state militia helped out the strikers and it was only when federal troops came that the demonstration was broken up.

TODD: None were mentioned.

ADJUDICATION

None described.

THE PULLMAN STRIKE

All of the authors except Davidson covered the strike. Bailey, Boorstin and Jordon accurately explained the causes but Todd described the troops coming in without explaining why they were necessary. This was the only event where all the authors explained the Constitutional issues.

There was a range of coverage on the delegation of power. Jordon was the only one who explained the complete process accurately, even from the point of the Attorney General's influence on the president to call out the troops. Jordon was the only one to describe the role of the marshals.

Even though Todd's coverage was the shortest, he was the only one to describe the famous conflict between Governor Altgeld who did not want the troops sent. Concerning the adjudication of the incident, Bailey and Jordon were the only ones to describe that Debs was sent to jail. None of them described In re Debs, the Supreme Court case which justified the president's authority in sending in troops. This case was an important milestone concerning the issue of federal intervention in domestic disorders and should have been described.

CAUSES

BAILEY: He explained in detail the background cause of the depression and cut wages.

BOORSTIN: He explained about the depression.

JORDON: He explained about the depression and the cut wages.

TODD: He did not explain about the depression but only said that the strike was caused when the workers refused to move the cars.

ISSUE

BAILEY: He explained that the issue was that the strikers were interfering with the U.S. mails.

BOORSTIN: He explained that the issue was enforcing the Sherman Anti-trust Act.

JORDON: He said that the issue was to guarantee the delivery of the mail.

TODD: He did say that there was a need to guarantee the mail delivery. He further stated that it was a violation of Sherman Anti-trust.

POWER

BAILEY: He clearly detailed the line of power between the Governor who did not feel that the strike was out of hand but that the Attorney General urged the dispatch. He said Cleveland supported Olney. He did not describe U.S. marshals.

BOORSTIN: He did say that President Cleveland used federal troops against workers. But there was no mention of the marshals and how the troops were called out. For a noted historian, this was his poorest explanation.

JORDON: On the surface, this seems to be a good explanation. However, closer scrutiny revealed misinformation. He explained that Olney convinced the president to send in troops, that Olney appointed Walker as special attorney, to Walker swearing in deputies. In actuality Olney was not the U.S. attorney but the Attorney General. Walker as a special attorney did not issue an injunction but Judge Grossman did. Also Walker did not swear in 3600 deputies but U.S. Marshal Arnold did.[53]

TODD: He very accurately explained the delegation of power between the governor and the president.

CONFLICTS

BAILEY: He explained the conflict between the governor who did not think the trouble was serious to the Attorney General who did.

BOORSTIN: He did not describe the conflicts between the state and federal authority but he was the only one to describe the conflict between the president and the voters. Because of his intervention of sending federal troops against starving workers, he lost the voter's support.

JORDON: No conflicts.

TODD: He did describe the conflict that the governor refused to call out the militia or ask for federal aid but the President sent troops anyway.

---

[53] Calhoun, *The Lawmen*, 208.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

ADJUDICATION

BAILEY: He did say that Debs was sent to jail for 6 months.

BOORSTIN: None

JORDON: He did say that Debs was sentenced to 6 months in jail.

TODD: None

1902 COAL STRIKE

Todd was the only one who did not cover the coal strike. All of the others explained the causes with Boorstin having the best. All of them spent four or five paragraphs on this incident making this the most consistently emphasized event. Bailey and Jordon were the only ones who clearly stated the issue. All of them accurately described President Roosevelt's authority in threatening to seize the mines but was finally able to negotiate. Jordon was the only one who explained the significance of President Roosevelt's sending in troops to protect public welfare instead of property. Jordon, Boorstin and Bailey all used primary source quotes in their explanation.

CAUSES

BAILEY: He explained that the miners demanded improvements and a pay increase and that the mine owners refused.

BOORSTIN: He explained numerous background causes and putting emphasis on the recklessness of the owners.

DAVIDSON: He explained the causes as the union asked for a shorter work day and better wages and the owners refused.

JORDON: He explained the need for higher wages and shorter work day and owners refusing.

ISSUES

BAILEY: He did not explain the issue which was violation of interstate commerce laws.

BOORSTIN: He did not clearly state the issue of violation of interstate commerce, although he did say that the railroads would stop running, he didn't explain the significance of that.

DAVIDSON: There was no clear statement of issues. However, by saying that he was hailed as the champion of working people he was implying that he was protecting the constitutional rights of people.

JORDON: He said that there was a new principle--that of the federal government protecting the public welfare.

POWER

BAILEY:	He did explain the president's role in this. However, he did not explain the Governor of Pennsylvania put down the violence and did not call for federal troops.
BOORSTIN:	He explained the president's role and that he might send the army.
DAVIDSON:	He described the president's role and that he threatened to send in the troops.
JORDON:	He described the president's role and how his intervention was different than in the past where the president had sent in troops to protect federal property and now they were intervening for public welfare.

CONFLICTS

BAILEY:	None
BOORSTIN:	None
DAVIDSON:	None
TODD:	None

ADJUDICATION

BAILEY:	None
BOORSTIN:	None
DAVIDSON:	None
JORDON:	None

1919 STEEL STRIKE

Bailey, Jordon and Davidson were the only ones who covered the 1919 Steel Strike. All explained the causes. The issues were not clearly stated. Jordon was the only one who accurately stated the delegation of power. No conflicts or judicial cases were discussed.

CAUSES

BAILEY:	He explained about the wage cuts.
DAVIDSON:	He explained about the demand for higher wages and the owners refusing to negotiate.
JORDON:	He explained the details of the poor conditions.

ISSUES

BAILEY:	He said it was a violation of state laws.
DAVIDSON:	No
JORDON:	No

POWER

BAILEY:	He explained that the Attorney General clamped an injunction but did not describe any state authorities.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

DAVIDSON: He explained that local police and state militia were called in but no federal troops.

JORDON: He gave the most complete explanation as a combination of U.S. steel security, state militia , and federal troops were called in.

CONFLICTS

None of the authors described these.

ADJUDICATION

None of the authors described these.

BONUS ARMY

Todd was the only one who did not cover the event. Boorstin only gave it one paragraph. All of the authors explained the causes but the issues was rather unclear. All explained the delegation of power. No conflicts or cases were described. Davidson and Bailey explained that the President Hoover's federal intervention led to his downfall.

CAUSES

BAILEY: He explained that the veterans came to Washington to demand payment of their bonus. Also he explained that they set up shacks on vacant lots which were a menace to public health. However, he failed to explain that it was the occupation of vacant buildings ready to be demolished that actually caused the need for federal intervention.

BOORSTIN: He explained that the veterans demanded their bonus. They occupied government land and empty government buildings and the president called out the army to drive them away.

DAVIDSON: He gave detailed background information about the demand for an immediate bonus and how they were camped in abandoned government buildings and tents.

JORDON: He gave detailed background information in the second paragraph.

ISSUE

BAILEY: He was the only one that explained they defied federal authority to leave.

BOORSTIN: He said that President Hoover called out the army to drive them away.

POWER

BAILEY: He explained that Hoover called out the troops and General MacArthur carried out the orders.

BOORSTIN: He said that President Hoover called out the army to drive them away.

DAVIDSON: He gave the best explanation because he described the role of the local police and the role of the president calling out the army. He was the only one to say that President Hoover called out the troops to tear down the camps.

JORDON:	He described the presence of the troops but there was no explanation of who called them.

CONFLICTS

BAILEY:	He described that the army carried his orders out with more severity than he had anticipated. He also added that this incident brought condemnation upon Hoover.
BOORSTIN:	None--However, he did quote the newspaper which condemned the army for making war on unarmed citizens.
DAVIDSON:	None between state and federal authorities. However, he did explain that the scene shocked the public.
JORDON:	None.

ADJUDICATION.

None of the authors described any cases.

YOUNGSTOWN STEEL STRIKE

None of the authors covered this event.

LITTLE ROCK

Only Davidson did not cover this event. Bailey and Todd only gave it one paragraph. Jordon and Boorstin gave the most detailed explanation of the causes. All of them correctly explained the issue. All of them explained that President Eisenhower sent in the troops. Jordon and Boorstin were the only ones who explained the conflict between the governor and the president. Only Boorstin said that the schools were closed in 1958. He did not explain that federal intervention was also needed then and that President Eisenhower changed his mind and now used U.S. marshals.

CAUSES

BAILEY:	He gave a detailed background of the causes, including Brown v. Board and the president's own personal feelings. However, the explanation of the actual incident was brief.
BOORSTIN:	He gave a detailed explanation of the Brown decision and the cause for intervention.
JORDON:	He gave a detailed explanation of the causes for intervention but did not describe the Brown case.
TODD:	He very briefly said that attempts at school integration as directed by the Supreme Court led to violence.

ISSUE

BAILEY: He explained the Supreme Court's decision and that the governors's action was a direct challenge to federal authority.

BOORSTIN: He could have been more clear in stating that this was an enforcement of the Supreme Court decision. He did say that the president thought the decision was correct.

JORDON: He did very clearly state that the president ordered the troops to uphold the law.

TODD: He said that the Supreme Court had directed school integration and that the president sent troops to maintain order so you had to read between the lines to get the issue of enforcement.

POWER

BAILEY: He explained that when the governor prevented the students from enrolling, the president sent in the troops.

BOORSTIN: He gave an excellent explanation of the delegation of power from the governor preventing the children from enrolling to the president nationalizing the guard and later ordered the troops. He said that the governor ordered the schools closed again in 1958 but failed to say that the marshals were sent in then.

JORDON: He described the governor calling out the national guard and the president calling the troops and federalizing the national guard. He also said that it was the first time since reconstruction that the power of the federal government was used to protect Blacks in the South. He said that the governor closed the schools in 1958 but failed to say that the marshals were sent in.

TODD: He very briefly said that President Eisenhower sent federal troops.

CONFLICTS

BAILEY: He did explain that the conflict committed by the governor was a direct challenge to federal authority.

BOORSTIN: He did explain the conflict with the governor and a federal judge forcing the National Guard to be removed. Also he explained that the president federalized the national guard to take it out of the control of the governor.

JORDON: He explained the background conflict with the governor calling out the National Guard. He also explained that Eisenhower federalized the National Guard.

TODD: He did not explain the conflict between the governor.

ADJUDICATION

BAILEY: None

BOORSTIN: None

JORDON: He did say that after a legal battle the schools opened in 1959.

TODD: None

FREEDOM RIDERS

Only Jordon, Boorstin and Todd described the freedom riders. Jordon gave the best description of the causes, the issues, the

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

delegation of power and the conflicts. Neither Boorstin nor Todd explained that the marshals were sent. Boorstin and Todd totally avoided the conflicts between state and federal authority. Jordon was the only one who accurately told the whole story.

CAUSES

Todd's description was too brief for analysis.

BOORSTIN: He explained that people were protesting against segregation of the races.

JORDON: He explained in detail about the background causes.

ISSUE

BOORSTIN: He explained that the issue was to ban segregation in interstate bus terminals. By reading between the lines it implied that this was a violation of Interstate commerce.

JORDON: He clearly stated that the issue was to enforce the 1950 Supreme Court decision banning segregation in interstate travel.

POWER

BOORSTIN: Although he explained federal intervention on the part of the Attorney General appealing to the ICC to ban segregation in bus terminals, this was only part of the story. He failed to explain that the state police were supposed to protect them and didn't. Also the Attorney General called out the U.S. marshals to protect further freedom riders.

JORDON: He very accurately explained that the failure of the local police caused the Attorney General to call in the marshals.

CONFLICTS

BOORSTIN: No conflicts were described.

JORDON: He clearly stated the conflicts between the local police not protecting the freedom riders and the marshals being sent in.

ADJUDICATION

BOORSTIN: Although no court cases were described, he did say that the Attorney General asked the ICC to ban segregation and this was done.

JORDON: He explained that the Attorney General ordered the ICC to integrate. This was done and the result was that the colored signs were removed.

JAMES MEREDITH

Todd was the only one who did not cover James Meredith . All of the authors explained the causes. Davidson and Jordon were the clearest on the issues. Boorstin was the only one who did not describe that the marshals were sent. Only Jordon and Boorstin explained the controversy between the governor and the president with Jordon giving the most detailed account. None of the lengthy court cases were described.

CAUSES

BAILEY: He explained that Meredith encountered opposition when he attempted to register.

BOORSTIN: He explained that a court ordered him to be admitted but the governor prevented it.

DAVIDSON: He explained that rioting broke out when Meredith attempted to register.

JORDON: He explained that the governor refused to allow Meredith to register.

ISSUE

BAILEY: He did not clearly state the issue but he did talk about integration of southern universities although he did not say that the source of this need was the decision in Brown.

BOORSTIN: By saying that a court ordered that Meredith be admitted, he was implying the issue of enforcement of court orders.

DAVIDSON: He said that the Attorney General was dealing firmly with the violation of civil rights.

JORDON: One had to read between the lines to get the issue that since the governor said that state laws on segregation were superior to federal law, then the Attorney General had to send in the marshals.

POWER

BAILEY: He explained that the president sent in the marshals (however, it was the Attorney General) and the troops.

BOORSTIN: He explained that the president ordered the troops. He did not say anything about marshals.

DAVIDSON: He said that the president sent in the marshals (however, it was the A.G.) and the troops and the marshals escorted Meredith.

JORDON: He accurately explained that the Attorney General sent in the marshals and they were forbidden to use guns. He said that the president sent in troops and federalized the National Guard.

CONFLICTS

BAILEY: He did not explain the conflict between the governor and the president. However, in another segment on Alabama he did describe the conflict between the Alabama governor.

BOORSTIN: He did explain that Governor Barnett personally prevented Meredith from registering.

DAVIDSON: He did not explain the conflict between Barnett and the president but he did explain the conflict with Wallace in the Alabama case.

JORDON: In great detail, he explained the conflict between Barnett who cited the doctrine of interposition and that the state laws were superior to federal laws.

ADJUDICATION

None of the authors described any cases.

WOUNDED KNEE

Only Todd, Boorstin and Davidson covered the domestic disorders concerning the Indians. Davidson only described Wounded Knee while the others described the background causes that led up to Wounded Knee such as the failure of the seizures of Alcatraz and the Bureau of Indian Affairs. Boorstin gave the most historically accurate account of all the events that led up to Wounded Knee. All of them described the historical significance of Wounded Knee as a symbolic place for Indian suffering Boorstin was the clearest in stating the issue. Both Boorstin and Todd accurately described the role of the marshals. Davidson only called them federal officers. None of the authors described the controversies that the federal agents had among themselves or the conflicts with the judge in the adjudication of one of the cases.

CAUSES

BOORSTIN: He said that the Indians took violent action to call attention to their wants. He very accurately explained all the background causes which led to Wounded Knee: the failure of the Alcatraz seizure and the failure of the seizure of the BIA building.

DAVIDSON: He did not explain the background causes in the reading but he did explain that under a picture that the Indians demanded Senate hearings on the U.S. treaties.

TODD: He explained in detail the background causes of Alcatraz and the BIA.

ISSUES

BOORSTIN: He explained that the Indians demanded all rights and property guaranteed to them.

DAVIDSON: The issue was under a picture that the Indians demanded Senate hearings on U.S. treaties (implying protection of Constitutional rights.)

TODD: He did not explain the issue.

POWER

BOORSTIN: He very accurately explained how the marshals evicted the Indians from Alcatraz. However, he only said that there was shooting between government agents at Wounded Knee when he could have been more clear and said that the agents were FBI, marshals and army.

DAVIDSON: He said that the government responded by sending federal law officers but did not define who they were or who sent them.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TODD:	He said that the U.S. marshals grimly confronted each other over barricades.

CONFLICTS

BOORSTIN:	He described the conflicts among the ranks of the Indians.
DAVIDSON:	None
TODD:	None

ADJUDICATION

None of the authors described any cases.

SECTION TWO DATA ANALYSIS BY AUTHOR

Table I is a presentation of data of author Bailey's description of federal intervention in domestic disorders in American Pageant. Of fifteen events selected for investigation for this study Bailey did not cover four of the events. This included the Dorr Rebellion, 1877 Railroad Strikes, Youngstown Strike, Freedom Riders and Wounded Knee. He described the causes in every event. He covered the Constitutional issues in the Whiskey Rebellion, Fugitive Slave, Pullman Strike, Little Rock, Freedom Riders, James Meredith and Wounded Knee. He did not cover issues in 1902 Coal Strike and the 1919 Steel Strike. He covered the delegation of power in the Whiskey Rebellion, Fugitive Slave, Pullman Strike, 1902 Coal Strike, Bonus March, Little Rock, Freedom Riders, Meredith and Wounded Knee. He did not cover the delegation of power in the Fugitive Slave Law and Bleeding Kansas. He covered political conflicts only in the Fugitive Slave Law, Pullman Strike, Bonus March and Little Rock. He did not cover conflicts in Bleeding Kansas, 1877 Railroad, and Pullman Strike, 1902 Coal Strike, Bonus March, Freedom Riders, and Wounded Knee. He covered the adjudication in the Whiskey Rebellion and the Pullman Strike. His emphasis ranged from a low of three sentences in Little Rock to a high of twenty-one sentences in the Whiskey Rebellion and Bleeding Kansas.

Table II is a presentation of data of author Boorstin's description of federal intervention in domestic disorders in A History of the United States. Of the fifteen events selected for investigation he covered eleven of the events. He did not cover the Dorr Rebellion, Enforcement Acts, 1919 Steel Strike and the Youngstown Strike. He covered the causes for each of the event except the 1877 Railroad Strike. He covered the Constitutional issues in the Whiskey Rebellion, Fugitive Slave, Pullman Strike, Little Rock, Freedom Riders, Meredith and Wounded Knee. He did not cover the issues in Bleeding Kansas, 1877 Railroad Strikes, 1902 Coal Strike, and Bonus March. He covered the delegation of power in the Whiskey Rebellion, Fugitive Slave, Pullman Strike, 1902 Coal Strike, Bonus March, Little Rock, Freedom Riders, Meredith and Wounded Knee. He did not cover the delegation of power in Bleeding Kansas, and 1877 Railroad Strikes. He covered the conflicts in the Whiskey Rebellion, Fugitive Slave, Little Rock and Meredith. He did not cover the conflicts in Bleeding Kansas, 1877 Railroad, Pullman Strike 1902 Coal Strike, Bonus March, Freedom Riders and Wounded Knee. He covered the adjudication only in the Whiskey Rebellion.

Table III is a presentation of data of authors Davidson and Lytle's description of federal intervention in domestic disorders in The United States A History of the Republic. Of the fifteen events under investigation the authors covered nine of the events. They did not cover Dorr Rebellion, 1877 Railroad Strikes, Pullman Strike, Youngstown Strike, Little Rock, and Freedom Riders. They covered the causes in the Whiskey Rebellion, Fugitive Slave, Bleeding Kansas, Enforcement Acts, 1902 Coal Strike, 1919 Steel Strike, Bonus March, and Meredith. They did not describe the causes of Wounded Knee. They covered the Constitutional issues in the Whiskey Rebellion, Fugitive Slave Law, Bleeding Kansas, Enforcement Acts, Meredith and Wounded Knee. They did not cover the issues in the 1902 Coal Strike, 1919 Steel Strike, and the Bonus March. They covered the delegation of authority in the Whiskey Rebellion, the Enforcement Acts, 1902 Coal Strike, 1919 Steel Strike, Bonus March, Meredith and Wounded Knee. They did not cover the delegation of power in the Fugitive Slave Law and Bleeding Kansas. They only covered the conflicts in the Whiskey Rebellion. They only covered the adjudication in the Whiskey Rebellion. Their range of emphasis went from a low of four sentences for the Enforcement Acts and Wounded Knee to a high of twenty-two for the Bonus March.

Table IV is a presentation of data of author Jordon's description of the role of federal intervention in domestic disorders in The Americans. Of the fifteen events under investigation Jordon covered eleven of them. He did not cover the Dorr Rebellion, Enforcement Acts, Youngstown Strike, and Wounded Knee. He covered the causes for all the events. He covered the Constitutional issues for the Whiskey Rebellion, 1877 Railroad Strikes, Pullman Strike, 1902 Coal Strike, Little Rock, Freedom Riders, Meredith and Wounded Knee. He did not cover the Constitutional issues for the Fugitive Slave Law, Bleeding Kansas, 1919 Steel Strike, and the Bonus March. He covered the delegation of power in the Whiskey Rebellion, Fugitive Slave Law, 1877 Railroad Strikes, Pullman Strike, 1902 Coal Strike, 1919 Steel Strike, Little Rock, Freedom Riders and Wounded Knee. He covered the conflicts in the 1877 Railroad Strikes, Little Rock, Freedom Riders, Meredith and Wounded Knee. He did not cover the conflicts in the Whiskey Rebellion, Fugitive Slave Law, Bleeding Kansas, Pullman Strike, 1902 Coal Strike, 1919 Steel Strike, and Bonus March. He only covered the adjudication in the Pullman Strike, Little Rock and Freedom Riders. (This was the highest for any author.) His sentence emphasis ranged from a low of five sentences to a high of thirty sentences. (This was the highest for any author.)

Table V is a presentation of data of authors Todd and Curti's description of federal intervention in domestic disorders in Triumph of the American Nation. Of the fifteen events selected for investigation the authors covered eight of them. (This was the lowest for each author.) The authors covered the causes in the Whiskey Rebellion, Bleeding Kansas, Enforcement Acts, Pullman Strike, Little Rock, and Wounded Knee. They did not cover them in the 1877 Railroad Strikes, or the Freedom Riders. They covered the Constitutional issues in the Whiskey Rebellion, Bleeding Kansas, Enforcement Acts, 1877 Railroad Strikes, Pullman Strikes, Little Rock, and the Freedom Riders. They did not cover the issues in Wounded Knee. The authors covered the delegation of authority in the Whiskey Rebellion, Bleeding Kansas, Enforcement Acts, 1877 Railroad Strikes, Pullman Strikes, Little Rock, and Wounded Knee. They did not cover the delegation of authority in the Freedom Riders. The authors covered the conflicts in the Whiskey Rebellion and the Pullman Strike. They did not cover the conflicts in Bleeding Kansas, Enforcement Acts, 1877 Railroad Strikes, Little Rock, Freedom Riders, and Wounded Knee. They did not cover any adjudication. Their sentence emphasis ranged from a low of two for the Freedom Riders to a high of nineteen for the Whiskey Rebellion.

TABLE I
Category System

AUTHOR: Bailey

TEXT: The American Pageant

EVENT SAMPLES	CAUSE	ISSUES	POWER	CONFLICTS	ADJUDI- CATION	SENTENCES # OF
WHISKEY REBELLION	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	22
DORR REBELLION	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
FUGITIVE SLAVE LAW	Y	Y	N	Y	N	19
BLEEDING KANSAS	Y	Y	N	N	N	22
ENFORCEMENT ACTS	Y	Y	Y	N	N	8
1877 RR STRIKES	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
PULLMAN STRIKE	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	13
1902 COAL STRIKE	Y	N	Y	N	N	16
1919 STEEL STRIKE	Y	N	Y	N	N	5
BONUS MARCH	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	16
YOUNGSTOWN STRIKE	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
LITTLE ROCK	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	3
FREEDOM RIDERS	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
MEREDITH	Y	Y	Y	N	N	8
WOUNDED KNEE	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....

SPECIAL CODES

Y means that the event and category were described.

N means that the event and category were not described.

..... Means that the event was not covered.

Sentences refers to the number of sentences allotted to the events.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TABLE II
Category System

AUTHOR: Boorstin

TEXT: A History of the United States

EVENT SAMPLES	CAUSE	ISSUES	POWER	CONFLICTS	ADJUDI-CATION	SENTENCES # OF
WHISKEY REBELLION	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	18
DORR REBELLION	......	......	......	......	......	......
FUGITIVE SLAVE LAW	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	8
BLEEDING KANSAS	Y	N	N	N	N	6
ENFORCEMENT ACTS	......	......	......	......	......	......
1877 RR STRIKES	N	N	N	N	N	1
PULLMAN STRIKE	Y	Y	Y	N	N	17
1902 COAL STRIKE	Y	N	Y	N	N	29
1919 STEEL STRIKE	......	......	......	......	......	......
BONUS MARCH	Y	N	Y	N	N	7
YOUNGSTOWN STRIKE	......	......	......	......	......	......
LITTLE ROCK	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	16
FREEDOM RIDERS	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	5
MEREDITH	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	4
WOUNDED KNEE	Y	Y	Y	N	N	17

SPECIAL CODES

Y means that the event and category were described.

N means that the event and category were not described.

...... Means that the event was not covered.

Sentences refers to the number of sentences allotted to the events.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TABLE III
Category System

AUTHOR: Davidson and Lytle

TEXT: The United States: A History of the Republic

EVENT SAMPLES	CAUSE	ISSUES	POWER	CONFLICTS	ADJUDI-CATION	SENTENCES # OF
WHISKEY REBELLION	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	15
DORR REBELLION	······	······	······	······	······	······
FUGITIVE SLAVE LAW	Y	Y	N	N	N	8
BLEEDING KANSAS	Y	Y	N	N	N	15
ENFORCEMENT ACTS	Y	Y	Y	N	N	4
1877 RR STRIKES	······	······	······	······	······	······
PULLMAN STRIKE	······	······	······	······	······	······
1902 COAL STRIKE	Y	N	Y	N	N	18
1919 STEEL STRIKE	Y	N	Y	N	N	10
BONUS MARCH	Y	N	Y	N	N	22
YOUNGSTOWN STRIKE	······	······	······	······	······	······
LITTLE ROCK	······	······	······	······	······	······
FREEDOM RIDERS	······	······	······	······	······	······
MEREDITH	Y	Y	Y*	N	N	5
WOUNDED KNEE	N	Y	Y	N	Y	4

SPECIAL CODES

Y means that the event and category were described.

N means that the event and category were not described.

····· Means that the event was not covered.

Sentences refers to the number of sentences allotted to the events.

TABLE IV
Category System

AUTHOR: Jordon

TEXT: The Americans

EVENT SAMPLES	CAUSE	ISSUES	POWER	CONFLICTS	ADJUDI-CATION	SENTENCES # OF
WHISKEY REBELLION	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	9
DORR REBELLION	......	......	......	......	......	......
FUGITIVE SLAVE LAW	Y	N	Y	N	N	5
BLEEDING KANSAS	Y	N	N	N	N	14
ENFORCEMENT ACTS	......	......	......	......	......	......
1877 RR STRIKES	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	30
PULLMAN STRIKE	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	25
1902 COAL STRIKE	Y	Y	Y	N	N	28
1919 STEEL STRIKE	Y	N	Y	N	N	15
BONUS MARCH	Y	N	N	N	N	17
YOUNGSTOWN STRIKE	......	......	......	......	......	......
LITTLE ROCK	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	19
FREEDOM RIDERS	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	7
MEREDITH	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	14
WOUNDED KNEE	......	......	......	......	......	......

SPECIAL CODES

Y means that the event and category were described.

N means that the event and category were not described.

..... Means that the event was not covered.

Sentences refers to the number of sentences allotted to the events.

TABLE V
Category System

AUTHOR: Todd and Curti

TEXT: *Triumph of the American Nation*

EVENT SAMPLES	CAUSE	ISSUES	POWER	CONFLICTS	ADJUDI-CATION	SENTENCES # OF
WHISKEY REBELLION	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	19
DORR REBELLION	....	....	....	....	....	....
FUGITIVE SLAVE LAW	....	....	....	....	....	....
BLEEDING KANSAS	Y	Y	Y	N	N	5
ENFORCEMENT ACTS	Y	Y	Y	N	N	11
1877 RR STRIKES	N	Y	Y	N	N	7
PULLMAN STRIKE	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	9
1902 COAL STRIKE	....	....	....	....	....	....
1919 STEEL STRIKE	....	....	....	....	....	....
BONUS MARCH	....	....	....	....	....	....
YOUNGSTOWN STRIKE	....	....	....	....	....	....
LITTLE ROCK	Y	Y	Y	N	N	3
FREEDOM RIDERS	N	Y	N	N	N	2
MEREDITH	....	....	....	....	....	....
WOUNDED KNEE	Y	N	Y	N	N	10

SPECIAL CODES

Y means that the event and category were described.

N means that the event and category were not described.

.... Means that the event was not covered.

Sentences refers to the number of sentences allotted to the events.

SECTION THREE: OVERALL DATA

Table VI is a presentation of tabled data summarizing the number of the fifteen events covered by each of the five authors. This represents the emphasis of coverage by the authors. All five authors covered two of the events, the Whiskey Rebellion (1794) and Bleeding Kansas(1856-580. None of the authors covered the Dorr Rebellion (1842) or the Youngstown Strike (1948).

The most frequently covered events were 80% which included the Fugitive Slave Law (1850), Pullman Strike (1894), Coal Strike (1902), Bonus March (1932), Little Rock (1957), and Meredith (1962). The next most frequently covered events were 60% covering the Enforcement Acts (1870), 1877 Railroad, 1919 Steel Strike, Freedom Riders (1962) and Wounded Knee (1973).

Boorstin and Jordon covered the most events with eleven out of fifteen events covered. Bailey was next with ten out of fifteen, then Davidson with nine out of fifteen and finally Todd and Curti with the lowest at eight out of fifteen.

Table VII is a presentation of the sentence coverage of each event. This table represents the emphasis the authors put on each event. The 1877 Railroad Strike had the highest and the lowest number of sentences. The lowest coverage was the 1877 Railroad Strikes and the Freedom Riders. On the average, the 1902 Coal Strike had the most consistent coverage with an average of 22.8 sentences. The lowest average of sentence coverage was the Enforcement Acts and the Freedom

Riders. This demonstrates a wide range of coverage for each event by the authors.

Table VIII is a presentation of the data representing how each of the five subquestions were covered per event. Causes were covered the most with issues, power conflicts and adjudication covered in descending order. A descriptive analysis follows to answer the question: When domestic disorders are included, how accurately are they presented?

TABLE VI

SUMMARY OF EVENTS COVERED BY AUTHORS

	BAILEY	BOORSTIN	DAVIDSON	JORDON	TODD	% of Author Covering Event
WHISKEY REBELLION	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	100%
DORR REBELLION	N	N	N	N	N	0%
FUGITIVE SLAVE LAW	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	80%
BLEEDING KANSAS	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	100%
ENFORCEMENT ACTS	Y	N	Y	N	Y	60%
1877 RR STRIKES	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	60%
PULLMAN STRIKE	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	80%
1902 COAL STRIKE	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	80%
1919 STEEL STRIKE	Y	N	Y	Y	N	60%
BONUS MARCH	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	80%
YOUNGSTOWN STRIKE	N	N	N	N	N	0%
LITTLE ROCK	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	80%
FREEDOM RIDERS	N	Y	N	Y	Y	60%
MEREDITH	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	80%
WOUNDED KNEE	N	Y	Y	N	Y	69%
NO. OF EVENTS AUTHORS COVERED	10/15	11/15	9/15	11/15	8/15	

Y means that the event and category were described.

N means that the event and category were not described.

TABLE VII

EVENT/SENTENCE FREQUENCY

	HIGH	LOW
WHISKEY REBELLION	22	9
DORR REBELLION	0	0
FUGITIVE SLAVE	19	8
BLEEDING KANSAS	22	6
ENFORCEMENT ACTS	11	4
1877 RAILROAD	30	1
PULLMAN	25	9
1902 COAL	29	16
1919 STEEL	15	5
BONUS MARCH	22	7
YOUNGSTOWN	0	0
LITTLE ROCK	19	3
FREEDOM RIDERS	7	2
MEREDITH	18	4
WOUNDED KNEE	17	4

TABLE VIII

PERCENTAGES OF AUTHORS COVERING CATEGORIES PER EVENT

CATEGORIES	CAUSE	ISSUES	POWER	CONFLICTS	ADJUDI-CATION
WHISKEY REBELLION	100%	100%	100%	60%	60%
DORR REBELLION	0%	0%	0%	0%	60%
FUGITIVE SLAVE LAW	80%	60%	40%	40%	0%
BLEEDING KANSAS	100%	80%	20%	0%	0%
ENFORCEMENT ACTS	60%	60%	0%	0%	0%
1877 RR STRIKES	20%	40%	40%	20%	0%
PULLMAN STRIKE	80%	80%	80%	40%	60%
1902 COAL STRIKE	40%	20%	40%	20%	0%
1919 STEEL STRIKE	60%	20%	60%	0%	0%
BONUS MARCH	80%	20%	80%	20%	0%
YOUNGSTOWN STRIKE	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
LITTLE ROCK	80%	80%	80%	60%	0%
FREEDOM RIDERS	40%	60%	40%	40%	20%
MEREDITH	80%	80%	80%	40%	0%
WOUNDED KNEE	60%	40%	60%	20%	0%
% OF COVERAGE	64.9%	55.4%	53.5%	22.7%	10.3%

DESCRIPTIVE ANALYSIS OF TABLE VIII

CAUSES: Did the author explain the causes of the disorder which precipitated the need for the federal intervention?

This was the highest category covered with a 64.9% author coverage of the 15 events or 67.6% if one counts only the 13 events that the authors covered. All authors explained the causes of the Whiskey Rebellion and Bleeding Kansas. The least covered was the 1877 Railroad Strikes.

In the **Whiskey Rebellion**, all of the texts described the event as a protest inspired by Hamilton's fiscal program. All of the authors described that the farmers tarred and feathered revenue agents and refused to pay the tax. The sentence coverage ranged from a high of 22 to a low of 9. Bailey stated misinformation when he said that there were 13,000 troops when there were actually 15,000.

In the **Fugitive Slave Law** of the four authors who covered the event (Todd did not) all explained that there was opposition to the bill. Because of this "defiance" Northerners helped slaves to escape. The sentence count ranged from a high of 19 to a low of 8.

In **Bleeding Kansas** (which all authors covered) the sentence coverage ranged from a high of 22 to a low of 6. Bailey explained that there were two competing legislatures. However, he failed to mention the Compromise of 1850 which was the root cause of the problem. Boorstin said that the people were fighting over slavery. Davidson gave the best explanation of the background causes and the role of the

Compromise of 1850. Jordon explained about the two competing legislatures but failed to delve into the source of the problem--the Compromise of 1850. Todd explained that northerners and southerners rushed into the territory but failed to describe the source of the problem.

Only three of the authors Bailey, Davidson and Todd covered the **Enforcement Acts**. Bailey explained that the night riding lawlessness caused Congress to pass the Force Acts. Davidson said that the laws were passed to use force to prevent people from voting. Todd explained that the laws were passed to end lawlessness.

Only three of the authors, Boorstin Jordon and Todd described the **1877 Railroad Strikes**. Boorstin only gave it one sentence which did not contain enough information to analyze. Of the two authors, only Jordon explained the background causes. Jordon gave a thirteen sentence explanation of the causes following the heading "The Cause."

In the **Pullman Strike** only Davidson did not cover the strike. Bailey gave a detailed explanation of how the Pullman Car Co. hit by the depression cut wages and how the strikers stopped the company cars. Boorstin explained about the depression but failed to explain the significance of the Pullman cars. Jordon gave a detailed explanation of the depression, wages cut and the failure of the company to negotiate. So the union cut the cars out from the trains. Todd specifically stated that the strike was caused by workers who refused to handle the trains with Pullman cars. Thus those who included the depression, the reaction of the Pullman company and the Pullman cars not running, gave a complete explanation of the causes.

Concerning the **1902 Coal Strike** only Todd did not cover the event. Bailey explained that many illiterate immigrant workers had been exploited and accident plagued. They demanded improvements but the unsympathetic mine owners refused to negotiate. Boorstin explained that the coal mine owners were reckless of the safety of their men and had received no raise in wages for 20 years. Thus he explained both sides of the story: the workers and the owners. Davidson only explained that the workers wanted shorter working days and better wages. Jordon also only explained the need for higher wages and better working conditions.

In the **1919 Steel Strike**, only Bailey, Jordon and Davidson covered the event. Bailey explained that a wage cut of 12% by the Railway Labor Board provoked a 2 month strike. Davidson explained that the causes were demands for higher wages and shorter day. Jordon gave the most detailed explanation as he described the poor working conditions of the workers of the AFL to represent different occupations in the mills.

In the **Bonus Army**, Todd was the only one who did not cover the incident. Bailey explained that the veterans came to Washington to demand their bonus. He said that they set up shacks but he failed to describe the occupation of vacant buildings which actually caused the federal intervention. Boorstin explained that the veterans demanded their bonuses and occupied empty government buildings. Davidson gave a detailed explanation of the actions of Congress against the bonus bill and how the veterans camped in shacks and government buildings. Jordon also gave a detailed explanation of the actions of Congress concerning the Patman Bill (he was the only one to state the full name.) None of the texts clearly stated that it was the occupation of the abandoned government buildings that caused the need for federal intervention because the veterans were interferring with the demolition. Also there were several incidents of conflicting information. Jordon and Bailey said 1945 was the date the bonus was due while Davidson said it was 1941. The number of veterans was quoted as 17,000 in Jordon and Davidson but 20,000 in Bailey.

In **Little Rock** only Davidson did not cover the event. The sentence coverage ranged from a high of 19 to a low of 3. Bailey explained the background feelings of President Eisenhower toward the integration and that even though he was against it, he was forced to act. He also mentioned the Brown v. Board decision. Boorstin gave a detailed five sentence background scenario of what motivated Governor Faubus to segregate the schools and what the federal judge did to stop him. He also explained President Eisenhower's feeling about the Brown decision. Jordon gave a detailed explanation of Governor Faubus' reasons for his actions as well as the federal court's order to remove the guardsmen. Todd gave a very skimpy three sentence coverage. He also said that attempts at school integration led to violence.

In the **Freedom Riders**, only Boorstin, Jordon and Todd covered the event. This represented the shortest coverage of any event ranging from a high of only seven to a low of two. Todd's was too brief to do any analysis. Boorstin said that the freedom riders were protesting segregation of the races in the bus stations and were met by riots and beatings. Jordon gave a very detailed explanation of the purposes of the freedom ride and that they were met by mobs. He very clearly stated that the local police did little and this caused the need for federal intervention.

Concerning **James Meredith**, Todd was the only one who did not cover the event. Bailey gave a detailed explanation of King's campaign against discrimination. Meredith encountered violent opposition when he attempted to register. Boorstin merely said that Meredith tried to enroll. A court ordered that he be admitted but Governor Barnett prevented him. Davidson said that the Attorney General dealt with violations of civil rights. He explained that the rioting erupted which caused the need for federal intervention.

In **Wounded Knee**, only Boorstin, Davidson and Todd covered the event. Boorstin accurately described all the background causes that led up to the seizure of Wounded Knee. These included Alcatraz and the BIA Building in Washington. However, he only said that the Indians took these violent actions to draw attention to their wants but did not explain what these were. Later he correctly (and was the only one to do so) stated that the Indians opposed local tribal government. Still he gave the most complete explanation of causes. Davidson did not explain the causes. Todd explained the background causes from the seizure of Alcatraz, the Trail of Broken Treaties and the BIA building.

ISSUES: **Did the author explain the issues involved which legitimize the federal intervention? These issues are:**

a. **federal aid to states**

b. **enforcement of federal law**

c. **preservation of Constitutional rights (and ensuring a republican form of government.**

These issues involved the two categories in which presidents have been involved. In enforcing federal law, the president can act on his own initiative. In preservation of Constitutional rights or a republican form of government, the president can act only on application from the legislature or state governor if the legislature is not in session. Issues were covered on an average of 58.6% or three out of five authors covered issues.

In the **Whiskey Rebellion**, Bailey did not use the term enforce federal law but it was implied from "Hamilton's excise tax" and the farmers actions were a challenge to the new government. Boorstin was the only one of all the authors in all the events who described that Washington was "fulfilling his duty under the Constitution to maintain a republican form of government."

In the **Fugitive Slave Act**, four authors covered the event. Jordon did not describe or make reference to any of the issues. Bailey did use the term "enforce the new federal statute." Boorstin also used the phrase "enforcing the Fugitive Slave Act." Davidson was the only one who clearly referred to the Constitutional rights by explaining that "the Constitution permitted them to hold slaves as property."

In **Bleeding Kansas** all authors covered the event. None of the authors clearly stated that there was a violation of territorial government laws. Also none of them clearly stated the issue of popular sovereignty. The Kansas-Nebraska Act of 1854 left the status of slavery in the Kansas-Nebraska region to be settled by popular sovereignty. There was reference made to the two legislatures but the source of the issue was not probed. Bailey described the choice between the two governments but never used the word popular sovereignty. Boorstin described the two sides but never clearly stated the issue of popular sovereignty. Davidson gave the clearest explanation of the two competing governments. Davidson gave the clearest explanation of the two competing governments. He was the only one to explain that there was a "question of extending slavery to the territories." He also stated the term Fugitive Slave Law. Jordon described that there were two sides but there was no mention of popular sovereignty. Todd described the two sides and said that they were fighting over slavery.

In the **Enforcement Acts** covered by only three authors, Bailey explained that the federal intervention was needed to stop the "lash law." Also he said that the White South flouted the 14th and 15th amendments. So one could imply from this the issue of enforcing federal statutes. Davidson very clearly said that the president could use troops to "enforce the laws." Todd gave the most complete statement of the use of federal force to supervise elections.

Only three authors covered the **1877 Railroad Strikes**. Boorstin only wrote one sentence which did not have enough substance to analyze. The issues involved here concerned the railroad or government property. Both Jordon and Todd explained that railroad property was destroyed. However, neither one explained the source of this.

In the **Pullman Strike**, four of the authors covered this (only Davidson did not.) All of them covered the issue which was a violation of federal law. Bailey said that the legal grounds for federal intervention was that the "strikers were interfering with the transit of U.S. mail." However, he does not explain the significance of this which was the essence of the issue in this case. Also he did not state the Sherman Anti-trust Act by name. Boorstin explained that the federal court declared that the striking union was a conspiracy in restraint of trade forbidden by the cut. Jordon said that the troops were sent in on grounds of guaranteeing the delivery of the mail.

In the **1902 Coal Strike** only Todd did not cover the event. Davidson, Bailey and Boorstin did not clearly state the issue. Jordon did say that there was a new principle, that of the federal government protecting the public welfare.

In the **1919 Steel Strike** only Bailey, Jordon and Davidson covered the event. None of the authors explained the issues. There was no reference to a violation of state laws.

In the **Bonus Army**, Todd was the only one who did not cover the event. None of the authors clearly stated the issue of protecting Constitutional rights or preserving a republican form of government. The president clearly stated the issue when he said "a challenge to the authority of the U.S. government has been met swiftly and firmly... We cannot tolerate the abuse of Constitutional rights, by those who would destroy all governments." [54]

In the **Little Rock** incident, only Davidson did not cover the event. Bailey said that there was a "direct challenge to federal authority." He had previously mentioned the court's decision in Brown.

---

[54] M.S. Reichley, Federal Military Intervention in Civil Disturbances (Washington, D.C:Georgetown University, 1939). 172.

Thus one could imply that this was an enforcement of federal laws. Boorstin also mentioned the Brown decision. He explained that Eisenhower felt that the president should not have become involved but he was forced to act anyway. Jordon very clearly stated that the troops were sent to uphold the decisions of the courts. Todd described the Supreme Court decision and Boorstin sent troops to maintain order. So one could read between the lines to obtain the issue of enforcement of federal laws.

In the **Freedom Riders** only Jordon, Boorstin and Todd described the event. Todd's description was too brief for analysis. For Boorstin's account, one had to read between the lines to find the issue of violation of Interstate Commerce laws. Jordon on the other hand, clearly stated that the issue was to enforce the 1950 Supreme Court decision banning segregation in interstate travel.

In **James Meredith**, Todd was the only one who did not cover the event. Bailey did not clearly state the issue but did describe the integration of universities. He did explain the source of this was Brown v. Board. Boorstin explained that a court ordered Meredith to be admitted. So one could imply that there was the issue of enforcement of court orders. Davidson clearly stated the issue of violation of civil rights. In Jordon, one had to read between the lines to get the issue of violation of federal laws. Thus only two of the authors clearly stated the issue.

In **Wounded Knee**, only Todd, Boorstin and Davidson covered the event. Boorstin explained that Indians demanded all rights guaranteed to them. Davidson stated the issue under a picture. This said that the Indians demanded Senate hearings on U.S. treaties implying protection of Constitutional rights. Todd did not explain the issue.

POWER: **Did the author explain the delegation of power between the federal and state authorities in determining federal intervention? This included the following:**

a. **The president received notification from the governor or judge that disorder exists.**

b. **The president is told that state authorities were incapable of preserving the peace.**

c. **The state legislature is not in session.**

d. **The legislature could not be convened in time to meet the emergency.**

e. **The appeal to the president was to protect the state against domestic violence.**

f. **The president orders a proclamation.**

g. **The president decides whether or not to send in federal forces.**

In this section the rater looked for the step by step process and the description of duties of the state and federal authorities. The state authorities had to fail first before the federal authorities could be sent in. After these conditions were met and the president ordered a "cease and desist," then the decision rested on the president whether or not to send in troops. Also from this section comes the principle of civilian control of the military.

All of the authors covered the **Whiskey Rebellion**. All of them except Jordon said that President Washington called the troops. Jordon only described Hamilton's role. The uninformed reader might get the idea that Hamilton called the troops. Boorstin and Todd were the only one who described the role of the civilian authority, the marshals. None of the authors explained that a proclamation was issued.

In the **Fugitive Slave Act**, of the four authors who covered the event Bailey, Davidson and Jordon explained the role of the federal commissioner. However, Boorstin and Davidson incorrectly put the emphasis on state, city and citizens returning the slaves. Bailey did not say who was responsible for the return of the slaves. Jordon was the only one who correctly explained that slave holders could demand assistance from federal marshals. None of the authors described any stories of slave escapes. But not doing this, they missed the opportunity to explain how the marshals called in federal troops to help them with the resistance of the citizenry with the return of runaway slaves.

The necessity for federal intervention in the 1850's focused on either the slavery question or maintaining order in the territories. The Fugitive Slave Law provided for commissioners to issue certificates for the return of fugitive slaves and for the U.S. marshals to see that fugitives were returned. When opposition to the enforcement of the act first occurred President Fillmore called a cabinet meeting to determine how to handle the situation. He concluded that he had "an inherent executive power" to use troops to enforce the Constitution. The cabinet did agree on giving the authority to the U.S. marshals to call troops when a district judge or justice of the Supreme Court should deem it necessary.[55] There were several incidents which called for federal intervention. One such crisis erupted in Boston when a slave Shadrach was freed.

Attorney General Caleb Cushing defined the right of the marshal to use organized bodies of militia or regulars as part of the posse on his own authority. This "Cushing Doctrine" allowed a U.S. marshal to call on federal military forces without any reference to the president.[56] None of the textbooks covered this aspect of the delegation of power.

---

[55] Coakley, Role of Federal Military, 129.

In **Bleeding Kansas** all of the authors covered the event but only Todd explained that federal troops were brought in to restore order. Thus this was the poorest coverage of the delegation of power of all the events. There were many missed opportunities for the coverage of federal intervention. President Pierce in a message to Congress January 24, 1856 said it was the not the duty of the president to impose federal force "to preserve the purity of elections" but only to ensure the enforcement of the laws.

Even though all the authors described the sack of Lawrence, none of them explained that the territorial governor asked for military support for the marshal. Contingents of troops accompanied marshals as a posse comitatus in making arrests or to assist in executing the law. The use of the military was resented by many civilians. [57] Yet the use of the military in 1856 helped prevent a civil war and in the end guaranteed the triumph of the freestate cause. This was a very significant use of the military which should have been covered in the textbooks. Yet Todd was the only one who covered it. He did correctly state that two hundred lives were lost before the federal troops restored order.

In the **1877 Railroad Strike**, Jordon gave a detailed explanation of the delegation of power. He explained that the railroad asked the governor to request federal troops(but did not mention the president.) He explained that the militia went over to the strikers side. This was one of the few accounts of a balanced account of the incident because he presented the feelings of both sides. Only when federal troops arrived did the demonstration disperse. Todd very accurately said that President Hayes sent federal soldiers when state troops could not restore order. Thus both authors had accurate accounts of the delegation of power.

---

[56] Ibid.,132.

[57] Bert Cantwell, U.S. Marshal in Kansas, (Master's Thesis, Wichita State University, 1980), 18.

In the **Pullman Strike** Bailey explained the delegation of power from the state to the federal. Governor Altgeld did not want the troops but the Attorney General dispatched them anyway. There was no description of the role of the president or the marshals. Boorstin said that President Cleveland used federal troops against workers. But there was no description of the role of the governor or the marshals. Jordon on the surface seemed to give a good explanation but it was full of inaccurate information. He did accurately say that Olney convinced the president to send in troops. But he called Olney the U.S. attorney when he was actually the Attorney General. Also it was stated that Walker as a special attorney swore in deputies. In reality, Marshal Arnold did that. By definition set forth, in the Judiciary Act of 1789 and Enabling Act of 1792 only a marshal can call a posse.[58] Also it was stated that Walker issued an injunction. Only a judge can do that. It was actually Judge Grossman.[59] The author did accurately give the correct number of deputies at 3600.

Todd gave the best explanation of the delegation of power. He said that when Governor Altgeld refused to call out the state militia or ask for federal help, President Cleveland sent the federal troops. He did not explain that the marshals were brought in.

---

[58] Assistant Deputy Attorney General Bill Hall interview by author 22 January 1991, telephone.

[59] Calhoun, The Lawmen, 209.

In the **1902 Coal Strike**, Bailey explained only the president's role of negotiations. This was the only event in which the president negotiated without sending in troops. This event is an example of what Berman called "Friendly intervention". Boorstin described the president's role in negotiation and that he might send the army. Davidson said the same. Jordon described the president's role but was the only one to describe the significance of this. None of the texts described the role of the Governor of Pennsylvania who handled the violence with state militia and did not call for federal troops. Also none of the texts described the president's last ditch plan that would ask the governor to ask for help and then he would send in the army as per the Constitution.[60] Thus the story of federal intervention was only half told in this case.

None of the texts presented a balanced approach because none of them explained how President Roosevelt felt about his role in federal intervention. There was no precedent for him to follow. He commented on his role:

> There was no duty whatsoever laid upon me by the Constitution and I had in theory no power to act directly unless the Governor of Pennsylvania or the legislature if it were in session should notify me that Pennsylvania would not keep order and request me as commander in chief of the army of the U.S. to intervene in keeping order."[61]

This clear cut delegation of power was left out of the texts.

In the **1919 Steel Strike** only three authors covered the event. Bailey only explained that the Attorney General clamped an injunction.

---

[60] Berman, Civil Disorders, 57.

[61] Ibid., 56.

He did not describe the role of state authorities or the president. Davidson explained that local police and state militia were sent in but did not describe the role of the federal troops. Jordon was the only one who accurately described the delegation of power from the U.S. steel security, state militia and federal troops. He did not explain that the state militia failed before the federal troops were sent in or who sent the federal troops.

In the **Bonus Army** four authors covered the event. Bailey explained that Hoover called out the troops and General Mac Arthur carried out the orders. Boorstin said that President Hoover called out the army. Davidson gave the most accurate explanation as he described the role of the local police and the role of the president in calling out the army. He was the only one who explained that President Hoover called out the troops to tear down the camps. Jordon said that troops were led by Army Chief of Staff Douglas Mac Arthur and his aide Major Dwight Eisenhower. There was no mention of the president calling out the troops.

In **Little Rock** four authors covered the event. Bailey explained that the governor mobilized the National Guard to prevent the students from enrolling and thus confronted with a direct challenge to federal authority, Eisenhower sent the troops to escort the children to class. He also went into detail about President Eisenhower's personal feelings about the Brown decision. By doing this, he gave a more balanced approach. Boorstin gave the most accurate explanation. He explained that Governor Faubus sent in the National Guard to prevent the black children from attending school. He also explained that a federal judge forced the National Guard to be removed. The he explained President Eisenhower's personal feelings and hesitation in acting. Next he explained that Eisenhower ordered the National Guard into federal service so the governor could not use them. Lastly 1000 paratroopers were sent in. In addition, the schools were closed in 1958. Boorstin failed to explain that the marshals were sent in then. Jordon was the only one who described the background motives of Governor Faubus. He said that the governor called out the National Guard to turn the black students away. Then a federal court ordered the guardsmen removed. He explained that the president ordered 1000 paratroopers and federalized the National Guard. He then explained that the schools were closed in 1958 but did not say that the marshals were sent in then.

All of the texts failed to say that after Little Rock in 1957, President Eisenhower turned to the marshals to enforce the orders of the courts. This represented a change in his policy and a return to the traditional view of relying first on civilian officials to enforce the law and resorting to the military only after the civilians failed.[62]

In the **Freedom Riders**, Jordon, Boorstin and Todd described the event. Todd's description was too brief for analysis. Boorstin explained that the Attorney General called on the ICC to ban segregation. There was no explanation of the failure of the local police to help them and the marshals called out to protect them. Jordon very accurately explained that the local police did little to protect the freedom riders. So the Attorney General sent 400 marshals to protect them. The texts failed to explain the significance of the intervention. The government had used civilian marshals rather than military troops and then only as a last resort. This was an example of "Kennedy federalism."[63]

---

[62] Calhoun, The Lawmen, 263.

[63] Carl Brauer, John F. Kennedy and the Second Reconstruction, (New York: Columbia University Press, 1977), 154.

In **James Meredith**, Bailey, Boorstin, Davidson and Jordon covered the event. Bailey explained that President Kennedy sent in four hundred marshals and 3000 troops when Meredith encountered opposition. He did not explain specifically that it was the governor who caused the opposition. Boorstin explained that Governor Barnett prevented Meredith from entering and President Kennedy ordered 5000 troops to the scene. He also said that he remained at the university protected by federal troops. He left out that he was protected by marshals. Davidson said that the president sent marshals to the campus to back the National Guard. There was no mention of the federal troops. Thus the account was not very balanced in the complete delegation of power. Jordon explained that Governor Barnett refused to allow Meredith to register citing the doctrine of interposition. He said that the Attorney General sent marshals to campus. Jordon was the only one to explain that the marshals were not allowed to use guns. He also said that the president later sent in troops and federalized the National Guard.

Wounded Knee was covered by Boorstin, Davidson and Todd. Boorstin explained that the marshals evicted the Indians at Alcatraz. At Wounded Knee he only referred to a shooting between government agents. It would have been more accurate to identify FBI, U.S. marshals, and the army. Davidson explained that the government sent federal law officers but did not identity them. Todd said that U.S. marshals confronted the Indians over barricades. This was the poorest explanation of the delegation of power. None of the texts identified all the agencies involved and none said who sent them.

CONFLICTS: 4. Did the author describe any conflicts between the president and state authorities?

This was one of the lowest covered category with only 22.7% coverage. The highest events covered were the Whiskey Rebellion and Little Rock with 60%. Next came Fugitive Slave, Pullman Strike, Freedom Riders and Meredith. The lowest averages were the 1877 Railroad Strike, 1902 Coal Strike and Wounded Knee.

In the **Whiskey Rebellion**, of the five authors who covered the event only Boorstin, Davidson and Todd described the conflict. The conflict was with Governor Mifflin of Pennsylvania who refused to call out the militia because he felt that the state courts could handle it.

A major conflict which all texts left out was between the President Washington and Secretary of State Randolph who was reported to be the source of information for a letter which the French government received. The letter said that the government provoked violence in the western county and magnified the danger to the republic.[64] Washington's suspicion of the Secretary's loyalty was enough to require Randolph's resignation.

In the **Fugitive Slave Act of 1850**, of the four authors who covered the event only two, Bailey and Boorstin described that states passed personal liberty laws which forbade state officials to assist federal courts. However, none of the texts explained any of the slave escapes and the conflicts with state officials in returning them.

---

[64] Thomas Slaughter, The Whiskey Rebellion, (New York: Oxford University, 1986), 222.

In **Bleeding Kansas**, none of the texts described any conflicts. This represented the poorest coverage.

In the **Enforcement Acts**, none of the texts described any conflicts. The authors missed the opportunity to explain that many times federal deputy marshals were arrested by state authorities when they tried to serve process.

> By arresting marshals the states could deny federal power and disrupt federal laws. Each arrest chipped away at the structure of federalism.[65]

In the **1877 Railroad Strike**, of the three authors who covered the event, only Jordon explained that the state militia sided with the strikers. Then the troops were sent in.

In the **Pullman Strike** of the four authors who covered the event, only Bailey and Todd described the conflict. This was the most famous conflict. Bailey explained that the governor did not think the trouble was serious. Todd explained that the governor refused to call out the militia but the president sent troops anyway.

In the **1902 Coal Strike**, none of the authors described any conflicts.

In the **1919 Steel Strike**, none of the authors described any conflicts.

In the **Bonus Army**, of the four authors who covered the event, only Bailey explained that the president felt that the army carried out its orders with more severity than he had anticipated.

---

[65] Calhoun, The Lawmen, 124.

In **Little Rock**, of the four authors who covered the event, Bailey explained that the conflict committed by the governor was a direct challenge to federal authority. Boorstin and Jordon also explained the conflict with the governor. Todd did not explain any conflicts. None of the authors explained that the presence of the paratroopers embarrassed the Eisenhower administration.

In **Freedom Riders**, of the three authors who covered the event, only Jordon clearly stated the conflicts between the local police not protecting the freedom riders. None of the authors described that Governor Patterson did not want the marshals sent in.

In **James Meredith**, of the four authors who covered the event, only Boorstin and Jordon explained the conflicts. Boorstin said that Governor Barnett personally prevented Meredith from registering. Jordon gave the best explanation in discussing that Governor Barnett said that state laws were supreme to federal laws. (Of course there is not reference to the supremacy clause of the Constitution which explains why this was not possible.)None of the authors explained the negotiations and numerous telephone conversations that went on behind the scenes between the president and the governor.

In **Wounded Knee** of the three authors who covered the event none of the authors explained any political conflicts. Boorstin said that there were conflicts among the Indians. There were conflicts among the federal agencies involved.

5) Did the author describe the adjudication of the incident?

This was the lowest category covered with only 10.#% coverage. Only three events were covered, Whiskey Rebellion, Pullman Strike and Freedom Riders. All of the events had major cases that could have been covered. The coverage of the adjudication was very superficial.

In the **Whiskey Rebellion** of the five authors who covered the event, only Boorstin said that the culprits were convicted of treason. Bailey and Davidson said that the culprits were pardoned. None of the authors described the case by name, U.S. v. Vigol 1795 or U.S. v. Mitchell. Also none of the texts explained the significance of these first treason trials in the federal courts and that they established the precedent that widespread opposition to the execution of a U.S. statute amounted to "levying war" against the United States.[66]

In the **Pullman Strike** of the four authors who covered the event, only Bailey and Jordon said that Debs was sentenced to 6 months in jail. Neither author described the In re Debs case which explained that under the Constitution, power over interstate commerce and transportation of mails is vested in the national government and that the national government may prevent any unlawful interference. The case was significant for establishing the supremacy of the federal government over the states.[67]

---

[66] Stephen B. Presser and Jamil S. Zainaldin, ed., Law and American History (St. Paul: West Publishing, 1982), 162.

[67] Ibid, 626.

In the **Freedom Riders** both Boorstin and Jordon explained about Attorney General Kennedy ordering the ICC to ban segregation.

The problem under investigation in this study focused upon federalism as it was portrayed in American history textbooks. Three major questions guided this study: 1) How well do senior high school American history textbooks portray federalism through description of domestic disorders? (2) When domestic disorders are included in these textbooks, how accurately were they presented? (3) When domestic disorders are included, how much emphasis is on each major event where the domestic disorder requires federal intervention? In order to determine the answer to the first question, five categories guided this study: (1) Did the author explain the **causes** of the disorders which precipitated the need for the federal intervention? (2) Did the author explain the **issues** involved which legitimized the federal intervention? (3) Did the author explain the delegation of **power** between the federal and state authorities in determining federal intervention? (4) Did the author describe any **conflicts** between the president and the state authorities? (5) Did the author describe the **adjudication** of the incident. The findings on each of those questions was as follows.

How well did the author explain the causes of the disorder which precipitated the need for federal intervention? This category represented the highest average. If the author covered the event the coverage represented 64.9% This high figure was misleading because the texts typically covered the immediate causes and did not probe the source or background causes. In the Whiskey Rebellion all of the texts said that the excise tax was the cause. It was more than that. There was a general discontent with the government over a number of things including the unsettled matter of free navigation of the Mississippi, lack of protection from the Indians and the handling of external threats on the high seas from Great Britain. Consequently, when the excise tax came, people in Washington County Pennsylvania refused to make sacrifices to a government that had ignored their needs. One said: "To be subject to all the burdens and enjoy none of the benefits arising from government is what we will never submit." [68]

In the Wounded Knee story the texts failed to probe the disillusionment, despair and high crime rate that was prevalent among the Indians at that time. Thousands of Indians marched across the United States to Washington, D.C., to force a discussion of lost treaty rights. It was against this background that the seizures of Alcatraz, the Bureau of Indian Affairs, the naval air station in Minneapolis and Wounded Knee took place.

How well did the authors explain the issues? This category was covered by 55.4% of the authors who covered the event. These issues investigated included federal aid to states, enforcement of federal law, preservation of Constitutional rights and preserving a republican form of government. The events receiving the highest issue coverage were the Whiskey Rebellion, Bleeding Kansas and the Pullman Strike. The events receiving the lowest coverage of the issues were the 1902 Coal Strike, 1919 Steel Strike and the Bonus March. Only one author, Boorstin in the Whiskey Rebellion, used the phrase "preserve a republican form of government." Todd and Curti were the only authors who made reference to how Southerners felt about the fact that the Constitution permitted them to hold slaves as property.

---

[68] Thomas Slaughter, The Whiskey Rebellion (New York: Oxford University Press, 1986), 164.

All of the texts failed to pick up on the intensity of the opposition to the Fugitive Slave Act. The opposition to the law and the challenges the U.S. marshals faced in trying to enforce the law, threatened the power of the federal government. President Filmore explained the issue involved here that "the main opposition is armed against the Constitution itself."[69]

Also in the Bleeding Kansas situation the texts failed to clearly explain the concept of popular sovereignty and the intensity of the opposition of free soilers and proslavery forces to the laws. U.S. Marshal Donaldson revealed the true significance of the mobs coming to Kansas when he reported to the territorial governor that :

> ...the powers vested in me as United States marshal for this territory are wholly inadequate for the suppression of the insurrectionary combinations now known to exist...with the total subversion of all law, both federal and territorial...[70]

None of the texts described what laws were broken. With the addition of quotes such as these, the issues could have been more clearly understood.

How well did the author explain the delegation of power between the federal and state authorities in determining federal intervention? This category was covered by an average of 53.5 % of the author's who covered the event. The best covered event included the Whiskey Rebellion, Pullman Strike, Bonus March, Little Rock and Meredith. The least covered events were Kansas and Enforcement with Dorr and Youngstown not covered by any. This category included the whole process of federal intervention. This included the following steps.

---

[69] Frederick Calhoun, The Lawmen, U.S. Marshals and their Deputies 1789-1989 (Washington, D.C.: Smithsonian Press, 1990), 86.

[70] Bert Cantwell, The U.S. Marshal in Kansas (Wichita: Wichita University Press 1980), 10.

> (1) The president receives notification from a governor or judge that disorder exists. (Jordon explained this when he said that the B & O asked the governor to request federal troops. Boorstin in the Whiskey Rebellion said that the governor thought they could handle the matter.
>
> (2) The president is told that state authorities were incapable of preserving the peace. (Todd was the only one to explain this in the 1877 Railroad Strike "when state troops could not restore order, President Hayes sent federal soldiers." (p. 543)
>
> (3) The state legislature is not in session. (No texts explained this.)
>
> (4) The legislature could not be convened in time to meet the emergency. (No text described this.)
>
> (5) The appeal to the president was to protect the state against domestic violence. (This was more clearly stated as the authors described the violent scenes. Boorstin explained that acts of violence were inevitable in Bleeding Kansas.)
>
> (6) The president ordered a proclamation. (None were described.)
>
> (7) The president decides whether or not to send in federal forces. (Four out of five texts said that Washington intervened in the Whiskey Rebellion due to Hamilton's urging. In the Pullman Strike, of the four authors who covered it, only two said that President Cleveland intervened because of the urging of the U.S. Attorney General Olney. The role of the president was described twenty-six times.) This exact procedure came from the Enabling Act of 1792.

In general the authors did describe the role of the state authorities. There were two good examples of this. One was Todd and Curti's explanation of 1877 Railroad Strike and Jordon's discussion of 1919 Steel Strike. Many times the authors did not describe who called the troops or why. This was most evident in Wounded Knee when none of the authors described the role of the president in the intervention. Only one author described the role of the federal troops in Bleeding Kansas, even though all authors covered the event.

In addition, the concept of the civilian control of the military which was such an important concern of our founding fathers, was also left out. The U.S. marshals were the civilian authority for law enforcement. Whenever the marshals were overcome by opposition, then the president called out the military.[71] When the texts described sending in federal forces it was usually the army. The U.S. marshals were also involved in most of the events. The role of the marshals was only described in five of fifteen events. The role of the FBI at Wounded Knee was not described by any text. Thus the texts failed to describe the delegation of power between the federal agencies involved in the intervention at Wounded Knee.

Also none of the authors explained the background negotiations that the president engaged in before sending in troops. These procedures were detailed in Berman's book and included investigation of issues, letters to both sides, meeting with contestants in conference and publicity of efforts. Only the 1902 Coal Strike described some of these procedures that the president accomplished.

How well did the author describe any conflicts between the president and the state authorities? This category was covered by authors on an average of 22.7 %. The highest events covered were the Whiskey Rebellion, Little Rock, Meredith, and Freedom Riders. The lowest included Kansas, Enforcement, Coal Strike, Steel Strike, Bonus March and Wounded Knee. This was one of the poorest covered. All authors covered the Whiskey Rebellion. Only one author, Boorstin covered the conflict between the governor who thought the courts could handle the matter. The most famous conflict was between Governor Altgeld who did not want President Cleveland to send in the troops. This was only covered by Bailey and Todd. In the Bonus March only one author, Bailey, said that federal intervention by the army was more severe than Hoover wanted. In Little Rock Bailey, Boorstin and Jordon all described the governor causing the conflict but Todd did not. In the Meredith affair Bailey and Davidson did not describe the conflict between the governor.. Boorstin and Jordon did. None of the authors covered the conflicts between the federal agencies at Wounded Knee.

---

[71] Calhoun, The Lawmen, 5.

How well did the author describe the adjudication of the incident? This category represented the poorest coverage. This was covered by the authors on an average of 10.3 %. The only adjudication described was in the Whiskey Rebellion, Pullman Strike and Freedom Riders. Even though three of the five authors covered the Whiskey Rebellion described that the rebels were tried and pardoned, none of them explained that this was the first treason trial. Three of the four authors covering the Pullman Strike explained that Debs was jailed. But none of the authors explained the significance that the case supported the president's federal intervention.

The two events that were not covered by any authors, the Dorr Rebellion and Youngstown Strike resulted in important cases. In Luther v. Bordon, the outcome of the case was that it was the president who should be the sole determiner of when to send in federal forces. In Youngstown Steel and Tube Co. v. Sawyer 1952, the court found that the president did not have the authority to seize the steel mills to assure continued production of defense ends. Thus the decision limited the power of the president in federal intervention in domestic disorders.

The second question guiding this study was when domestic disorders were included in these textbooks, how accurately were they presented. In general the textbooks were accurate. There were some incidents of minor technicalities. These inaccuracies usually involved numbers of troops and deaths. Other inaccuracies involved descriptions of the roles of the participants. In describing the Whiskey Rebellion authors gave different numbers on how many troops were used and how many lives lost. Bailey incorrectly gave the number of troops at 13,000 (it was 15,000). He did correctly give the number of lives lost. Jordon gave the correct number of troops at 15,000 but said that no lives were lost.

There were also conflicting reports on the date that the Bonus was due the veterans. Bailey and Jordon said it was payable in 1945. Davidson said it was 1941.

In the Pullman Strike Jordon incorrectly identified key players and their duties. He called Attorney General Olney a U.S. Attorney. He said special attorney Walker issued an injunction when only a judge is empowered to do so. He also said that Walker swore in the deputies when that is the job of the marshals.

The U.S. marshals were given the primary responsibility for returning fugitive slaves according to the Fugitive Slave Act and the decision in U.S. v. Prigg. Jordon was the only one who described this role. Davidson and Boorstin focused on ordinary citizens returning the fugitive slaves.

The third question dealt with how much emphasis was given to each major event. In order to determine this, the number of sentences allotted to each event was recorded. The highest sentence coverage was the 1877 Railroad Strike which also received the lowest emphasis of one sentence. There was only one event that received a large emphasis from all authors and that was the 1902 Coal Strike. All other events had sharp differences between the highest number of sentences describing that event and the lowest number of sentences.

Other studies found that there was less emphasis on black issues and Indians. In this study issues concerning blacks such as Fugitive Slave, Little Rock and Meredith received some of the highest emphasis.

They also received the lowest. Only the Freedom Riders consistently received a low emphasis . The one issue concerning Indians, Wounded Knee had sharp differences between high and low with an average of 10.3 sentences by the three authors.

WHAT DOES THIS MEAN?

Even though every text has a section on the Constitutional convention and explains the concept of federalism, the authors do not present federalism by example throughout their American history textbook. Most texts explained federalism through a chart or other media illustrating how governmental powers are delegated to national and state governments. When describing domestic disorders throughout American history that illustrate federalism in action, few references are made to the federal system. The powers of the states under federalism and the fact that those state powers must fail before the federal government can intervene were usually omitted in the textbooks.

Two of the five authors include a copy of the U.S. Constitution in their texts. They also gave an annotated description of each section. Jordon in The Americans described Article 4 Section 4 as :

> This section insures that each state is a republic. A republic is a form of government in which the people elect officials to represent them. This section guarantees each state federal protection against invasion and domestic violence. President Eisenhower used this power in 1957 when he ordered the Arkansas National Guard into federal service at Central High in Little Rock. [72]

Todd and Curti also put the Constitution in their text. They said of Article 4 Section 4:

> If public property is being destroyed and public safety endangered in a state, the President may decide to send troops into the state without

---

[72] Winthrop Jordon, Miriam Greenblatt, and John Bowes, The Americans A History.(Evanston, Illinois: McDoughal Littel & Co., 1991), 171.

> having been requested to do so by local authorities. The President may even proclaim martial law in a state. This section also guarantees that states can govern only be consent of the governed.[73]

Todd and Curti also had a section on "individuals and the law," in which they discussed debates the delegates had about what to do if citizens of a state refused to obey a federal law. The delegates decided that:

> To insure obedience to these laws, the delegates decided that the federal government had to have the power to reach into the states themselves to punish violators.[74]

Davidson devoted a large section to federalism (thirty-five sentences). He also gave the views of four convention delegates on the question of slavery in the Constitution. He then stated that "federalism is the central characteristic of the American political system." Obviously, these authors recognize the importance of federalism, but they failed to emphasize federalism throughout textual content.

The role of federalism in domestic disorders has been better explained in a 1991 American history text, The History of the United States by Thomas Dibacco. Dibacco's background was in business history. His book tends to cover federal intervention better especially in the labor strikes. Some of the highlights of the book concerning the federalism issue included in the Whiskey Rebellion, concerning the role of the state authorities and conflicts between state and federal authorities, "state governors with an eye on the ballot box would do nothing about the tax rebellion;"[75] in the Enforcement Acts concerning the delegation of power "with the help of the cavalry, federal marshals arrested thousands of Klansmen"[76] and in the 1877 Railroad Strikes he properly explained that the local militia were unreliable and that the president called out the troops. Dibacco also described the background causes and gave detailed background explanations of negotiations in the 1902 Coal Strike. He also used the term "enforce federal law" more often than the others. Thus this one text corrects many of the criticism of the other texts analyzed in this study.

---

[73] Lewis Paul Todd, and Merle Curti, The Triumph of the American Nation (Orlando: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1986), 160.

[74] Ibid., 176.

Gagnon was concerned that democracy's story was only half told. Similar conclusions were reached in this study. The story of federalism was only partially told in senior high school American history textbooks portrayal of federal intervention in domestic disorders. Many texts left out vital elements such as state authorities and the delegation of power between the state and national governments and between the civilians and the military. Fitzgerald criticized textbooks for not probing the source of the problems. In this study often times only immediate and not background causes were explained. Garcia concluded that material on blacks was unevenly distributed. Similar conclusions were reached in this study by looking at the emphasis of issues that blacks were involved in such as Fugitive Slave, Little Rock, Meredith and Freedom Riders. Kelly in discussing the treatment of controversial issues found that they were briefly treated and failed to provide a balanced presentation. In this study domestic disorders, which can be considered controversial were sometimes only covered by one sentence. Many times only one side of the story was included.

---

[75] Thomas Dibacco, The History of the United States (Atlanta: Houghton Mifflin, 1990), 172.

[76] Ibid. , 266.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The textbooks have two to three authors with a few curriculum consultants and a number of social studies educators listed as reviewers. The best combination of authors to describe the role of federalism would be to have a historian, a political scientist or a legal scholar and an economist on the staff. A legal scholar should be required as a consultant on all textbooks. Only one text, The Americans by Jordon specially lists a consultant on constitutional history.

There is an assumption that the textbooks provide a fool proof means of ensuring that students are successfully taught. With the portrayal of federalism that assumption cannot be made. With so many of the important steps in the portrayal of federal intervention left out, students reading the texts have little sense of the development of federalism in domestic disorders and the principles on which the federal intervention was called.

Teachers should rely less on the textbook and teach their students to be historians. The teacher should incorporate as many primary source documents into the classroom. There are many agencies that publish primary source packets. These include the National Archives and the National Center for History in the Schools at UCLA. Then the students should do research at historical societies or archives to discover for themselves what really happened in a particular event. With this knowledge, they can compare this to the textbook.

President Reagan in his Inaugural Address said that "history is a ribbon, constantly unfurling." Federalism is that thread that has run through that ribbon for over two hundred years binding our nation together and should be taught in the texts.

BAILEY
WHISKEY REBELLION
P. 156

MUTINOUS MOONSHINERS IN PENNSYLVANIA. The whiskey Rebellion,which flared up in southwestern Pennsylvania in 1794, sharply challenged he new national government. Hamilton's excise bore harshly on these homespun pioneer folk. They regarded it not as a tax on a luxury but as a burden on an economic necessity and a medium of exchange. Even preachers of the gospel were paid in "Old Monongahela rye." Defiant distillers finally erected whiskey poles, similar to the liberty poles of anti-stamp tax days in 1765, and raised the cry "Liberty and No Excise." Boldly tarring and feathering revenue officers, they brought collections to a halt.

President Washington, once a revolutionist, was alarmed by what he called these "self-created societies." With the warm encouragement of Hamilton, he summoned the militia of several states. Anxious moments followed the call for there was much doubt as to whether men in other states would muster to crush a rebellion in a sister state. Despite some opposition, an army of about thirteen thousand rallied to the colors, and two widely separated column marched briskly forth in a gorgeous, leaf-tinted Indian summer, until knee-deep mud slowed their progress. Washington accompanied the troops a part of the way; Hamilton, all the way.

The federal force was overpoweringly strong--larger in fact than Washington's army during much of the Revolutionary War. When the troops reached the hills of western Pennsylvania, they found no insurrection. The "Whiskey Boys" were overawed, dispersed, or captured. Washington, with an eye to healing old sores, pardoned the two small-fry convicted culprits. Hamilton, disgusted by this turn of affairs, wanted to punish the real ringleaders. Ironically, crushing the rebels cost more than three years' net revenue from the excise.

The Whiskey Rebellion was small--some three rebels were killed--but its consequences were large. George Washington's government, now substantially strengthened, commanded a new respect. Yet the numerous foes of the federalists condemned the administration for its brutal display of force--for having used a sledge hammer to crush a gnat. The ranks of the Jeffersonians were consequently enlarged. Back country settlers, taught a harsh lesson, now saw the wisdom of forsaking the tar kettle for the battle box and voting for Jefferson.

BAILEY
FUGITIVE SLAVE
P. 379

Most alarming of all, the drastic new Fugitive Slave Law-"the Bloodhound Bill"--stirred up a storm of opposition in the North. The fleeing slaves could not testify in their own behalf, and they were denied a jury trial. These harsh practices threatened to create dangerous precedents for the white. The federal commissioner who handled the case of a fugitive would receive five dollars if the runaway were freed and ten dollars if not-an arrangement that strongly resembled a bribe. Freedom-loving northerners who aided the slave to escape were liable to heavy fines and jail sentences. They might even be ordered to join slave catchers, and this possibility rubbed salt into old sores.

So savage was this "Man-Stealing Law" that it touched off an explosive chain reaction in the North. Many shocked moderates, hitherto passive, were driven into the swelling ranks of abolitionists. Cried one poet:

Lashed with her hounds, must we
Run down the poor who flee
From Slavery's hell?

The Underground Railroad stepped up its timetable, while infuriated northern mobs rescued slaves from their pursuers. Massachusetts, in a move toward nullification suggestive of South Carolina in 1832, made it a penal offense for any state official to enforce the new federal statute. Other states passed "personal liberty laws" which denied local jails to federal officials and otherwise hampered enforcement. The abolitionists rent the heavens with their protests against the man-stealing statute. A meeting presided over by Garrison in 1851 declared, "We execrate it, we spit upon it, we trample it under out feet."

Beyond question, the Fugitive Slave Law was an appalling blunder on the part of the South.

REGARDING THE FUGITIVE SLAVE ACT OF 1850

Ralph Waldo Emerson declared (May 1851) at Concord Massachusetts: "The act of Congress is a law which every one of you will break on the earliest occasion-a law which no man can obey, or abet the obeying, without loss of self-respect and forfeiture of the name of gentleman." Privately he wrote in his journal: "This filthy enactment was made in the nineteenth century by people who could read and write. I will not obey it, by God." (July 1851)

BAILEY
KANSAS
P. 394

Crisis conditions in Kansas rapidly worsened. When the day came in 1855 to elect members of the first territorial legislature, proslavery "border ruffians" poured in from Missouri to vote early and often. The slavery supporters triumphed and then set up their own puppet government at Shawnee Mission. The free-soilers unable to stomach this fraudulent conspiracy established an extralegal regime of their own in Topeka. The confused Kansans thus had their choice between two governments--one based on fraud and the other on illegality.

Tension mounted as settlers also feuded over conflicting land claims. The breaking point came in 1856 when a gang of proslavery raiders, alleging provocation, shot up and burned a part of the free-soil town of Lawrence. This outrage was but the prelude to a bloodier tragedy.

Kansas in Convulsion

The fanatical figure of John Brown now stalked upon the Kansas battlefield. Spare, gray-bearded, iron-willed, and narrowly ignorant, he was dedicated to the abolitionist cause. The power of his glittering gray eyes was such, so he claimed, that his stare could force a dog or cat to slink out of a room. Becoming involved in dubious dealings, including horse stealing, he moved to Kansas from Ohio with a part of his large family. Brooding over the recent attack on Lawrence, "Old Brown" of Osawatomie led a band of his followers to Pottawatomie Creek, in May 1856. There they literally hacked to pieces five surprised men, allegedly proslaveryites. This fiendish butchery, clearly the product of a deranged mind, besmirched the free-soil cause and brought vicious retaliation from the proslavery forces.

Yet by 1857 Kansas had enough people, chiefly free-soilers, to apply for statehood on a popular-sovereignty basis. The proslavery forces then in the saddle, devised a tricky document known as the Lecompton Constitution. The people were not allowed to vote for or against the constitution as a whole, but for the constitution either "with slavery" or "with no slavery." If they voted against slavery, one of the remaining provisions of the constitution would protect the owners of slaves already in Kansas. So whatever the outcome, there would still be black bondage in Kansas. Many free-soilers, infuriated by this trick, boycotted the polls. Left to themselves, the slaveryites approved the constitution with slavery late in 1857.

BAILEY
FORCE ACTS
P. 473

Congress, outraged by this night-riding lawlessness, passed the harsh Force Acts of 1870 and 1871. Federal troops were able to stamp out much of the "lash law," but by this time the "Invisible Empire" had already done its work of intimidation. Many of the outlawed groups continued their tactics in the guise of "dancing clubs," "missionary societies," and "rifle clubs," though the net effect of all the hooded terrorists has probably been exaggerated. Economic reprisals were often more effective, especially when causing blacks to lose their jobs.

Attempts to empower the blacks politically failed miserably. The white South, for many decades, openly flouted the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Amendments. Wholesale disfranchisement of the blacks, starting conspicuously about 1890, was achieved by intimidation, fraud and trickery. Among various underhanded schemes were the literacy tests, unfairly administered by whites to the advantage of illiterate whites.

BAILEY
PULLMAN
P. 584

CLEVELAND CRUSHED THE PULLMAN STRIKE.

Violent flare-ups accompanied labor protests, notably in Chicago. Most frightening was the crippling Pullman strike of 1894. Eugene Debs, an impetuous but personally lovable labor leader, had helped organize the American Railway Union of about 150,000 members. The Pullman Palace Car Company, which maintained a model town near Chicago for its employees, was hit hard by the depression and cut wages about one-third, while holding the line on rent for the company houses. The workers finally struck--in some places overturning Pullman cars and paralyzed railway traffic from Chicago to the Pacific Coast.

This terrorism in Chicago was serious but not completely out of hand. At least this was the judgment of Governor Altgeld of Illinois, a friend of the downtrodden who had pardoned the Haymarket Square anarchists the year before. But Attorney General Olney, an arch-conservative and an ex-railroad attorney urged the dispatch of federal troops. His legal grounds were that the strikers were interfering with the transit of the United States mail. Cleveland supported Olney with the ringing declaration, "If it takes the entire army and navy to deliver a postal card in Chicago, that card will be delivered."

To the delight of conservatives, the Pullman strike was crushed by bayonet-supported intervention from Washington. Debs and his leading associates, who had defied a federal court injunction to cease striking, were sentenced to six months imprisonment for contempt of court. Ironically, the lean labor agitator spent much of his enforced leisure reading radical literature, which had much to do with his later leadership of the Socialist movement in America.

BAILEY
1902 COAL STRIKE
P. 639

TR'S SQUARE DEAL FOR LABOR

Theodore Roosevelt, though something of an imperialistic busybody abroad, was touched by the progressive wave at home. Like other reformers, he feared that the "public interest" was being submerged in the drifting seas of indifference. Everybody's interest was nobody's interest. Roosevelt decided to make it his. His sportsman's instincts spurred him into demanding a "Square Deal" for capital, labor and the public at large. Broadly speaking, his program embraced three C's control of the corporations, consumer protection, and conservation of natural resources.

The Square Deal for labor received its acid test in 1902, when a crippling strike broke out in the anthracite coal mines of Pennsylvania. Some 140,000 besooted workers, many of them illiterate immigrants, had long been frightfully exploited and accident plagued. They demanded, among other improvements, a 20 percent increase in pay and a reduction of the working day from ten to nine hours.

Unsympathetic mine owners, confident that a chilled public would react against the miners, refused to arbitrate or even negotiate. One of their spokesmen, multimillionaire George F. Baer, reflected the high and mighty attitude of certain ungenerous employers. Workers he wrote, would be cared for "not by the labor agitators, but by the Christian men to whom God in His infinite wisdom has given the control of the property interests of this country." Closed minds meant closed mines.

As coal supplies dwindled, factories and schools were forced to shut down, and even hospitals felt the icy grip of winter. Desperately seeking a solution, Roosevelt summoned representatives of the striking miners and the mine owners to the White House. He was vastly annoyed by the "extraordinary stupidity and bad temper" of the "wooden-headed gentry" who operated the mines. As he later confessed, if it had not been for the dignity of his high office, he would have taken one of them "by the seat of the breeches" and "chucked him out of the window."

BAILEY
LITTLE ROCK
P. 845

CRISIS AT LITTLE ROCK

President Eisenhower was little inclined toward promoting integration. He shied away from employing his vast popularity and the prestige of his office, to educate white Americans about the need for racial justice. His personal attitudes may have helped to retrain him. He had grown up in an all-white town and spent his career in a segregated army. He had advised against integration of the armed forces in 1948 and had criticized Truman's call for a permanent Fair Employment Practices Commission. He complained that the Supreme Court's decision in Brown v. Board of Education had upset "the customs and convictions of at least two generations of Americans" and he steadfastly refused to issue a public statement endorsing the Court's conclusion, " I do not believe, he explained "that prejudices, even palpably unjustifiable prejudices, will succumb to compulsion."

But in September 1957 "Ike" was forced to act. Orval Faubus, governor of Arkansas, mobilized the National Guard to prevent nine black students from enrolling in Little Rock's Central High School. Confronted with a direct challenge to federal authority, Eisenhower sent troops to escort the children to their classes.

BAILEY
BONUS MARCH
P. 740

ROUTING THE BONUS ARMY IN WASHINGTON.

Many veterans of World War I were numbered among the hard hit victims of the depression. Industry had secured a "bonus" though a dubious one--in the Hawley-Smoot Tariff. So the thought of the former "doughboy" naturally turned to what the government owed them for their services in 1917-18, when they had "saved" democracy. A drive developed for the premature payment of the deferred bonus voted by Congress in 1924 and payable in 1945.

Thousands of impoverished veterans, both of war and of unemployment, were now prepared to move on to Washington, there to demand of Congress the immediate payment of their entire bonus. The "Bonus Expeditionary Force" (BEF), which mustered about twenty thousand souls, converged on the capital in the summer of 1932. These supplicants promptly set up unsanitary public camps and erected shacks on vacant lots--a gigantic "Hooverville." They thus created a menace to the public health, while attempting to intimidate Congress by their presence in force. After the pending bonus bill had failed in Congress by a narrow margin, Hoover arranged to pay the return fare of about six thousand bonus marchers. The rest refused to decamp, though ordered to do so.

Following riots that cost two lives, Hoover responded to the demands of the Washington authorities by ordering the army to evacuate the unwanted guests. Though Hoover charged that the "Bonus Army" was led by reds and riffraff, in fact only a sprinkling of them were former convicts and Communists agitators. The eviction was carried out by General Douglas MacArthur with bayonets and tear gas, and with far more severity than Hoover had planned. A few of the former soldiers were injured as the torch was put to their pathetic shanties in the inglorious "Battle of Anacostia Flats." An eleven month old "bonus baby" allegedly died from exposure to tear gas.

This brutal episode brought down additional condemnation on the once-popular Hoover, who by now was the most loudly booed man in the country.

BAILEY
MEREDITH
P.865

In the spring of 1963 King launched a campaign against discrimination in Birmingham, Alabama. A horrified world watched television screens as peaceful demonstrators were repeatedly repelled by the police with fire hoses, attack dogs, and electric cattle prods.

Integrating the southern universities almost brought wholesale slaughter. Some of them desegregated painlessly, but the University of Mississippi became a volcano. A twenty-nine year old air force veteran, James Meredith, encountered violent opposition when he attempted to register in October 1962. In the end President Kennedy was forced to send in four hundred federal marshals and three thousand troops. Two men died and scores were injured, but Meredith attended classes. He ultimately graduated--with a sheepskin that cost two lives and some 4 million taxpayer dollars.

In Alabama, Governor Wallace stood in the doorway to prevent two black students from entering the State University in June 1963. "Segregation now!" Segregation tomorrow! Segregation forever! he shouted. But he soon yielded to federal pressures and let the students pass.

BAILEY
STEEL STRIKE 1919
P. 722

Labor, suddenly deprived of its wartime crutch of friendly government support, limped along badly in the postwar decade. A bloody strike in the steel industry was ruthlessly broken in 1919, partly by exploiting ethnic and racial divisions among the steelworkers and partly by branding the strikers as dangerous "reds." The Railway Labor Board, a successor body to the wartime labor boards, ordered a wage cut of 12 percent in 1922, provoking a two month strike. It ended when Attorney General Daugherty, who fully shared Harding's big business bias, clamped on the strikers one of the most sweeping injunctions in American history. Unions wilted in this hostile political environment and membership dropped by nearly 30 percent between 1920 and 1930.

BOORSTIN
BLEEDING KANSAS
P. 265

Acts of violence were inevitable in Kansas, but only twice did the situation become critical. In May 1856 a proslavery sheriff led a mob into antislavery Lawrence, sacking and burning the town. In revenge the self-proclaimed antislavery messiah John Brown led a party including his four sons to a proslavery settlement on Pottawatomie Creek. They dragged five men from their beds in the dead of night and murdered them by splitting their skulls and broadswords. Somehow Kansas avoided becoming a territory of total anarchy and civil war. Still, bands of armed men were killing each other over slavery.

BOORSTIN
1877 RAILROAD
P. 369

Then in 1877 a railroad strike that began on the Baltimore and Ohio Railroad spread across the country bringing death and destruction in its wake.

BOORSTIN
PULLMAN STRIKE
P. 369-70

LABOR DISCONTENT. Meanwhile the depression was causing havoc. Millions were out of work. The winter of 1894 brought widespread suffering. In April a self-made businessman, reformer, and Populist, Jacob Coxey, led an "army" of 500 workers on a march from Ohio to Washington to publicize the plight of the poor. In May federal troops were fighting the Pullman strikers outside Chicago. For the first time and to many people's surprise, the Sherman Antitrust Act was turned against the workers. The act had been passed to control large corporations. But now a federal court declared that the striking union was a "conspiracy in restraint of trade," forbidden by the act. The court enforced its decision by issuing an order, called an "injunction," that told the union to stop the strike. This was a powerful new weapon. It made the strikers criminals if they refused to obey the court order and go back to work. The companies could now turn to the courts to stop a strike.

President Cleveland still seemed powerless against the depression. He had refused to give people "cheap money." He had used federal troops against starving workers. It is no wonder that he lost the voter's support. In the fall elections of 1894, the Populists' vote increased by 42 percent. And the Republicans, from being a minority in the House, jumped to a 141 seat majority. This was the largest congressional gain ever recorded. They also won control of the Senate.

BOORSTIN
WHISKEY REBELLION
P. 128

THE WHISKEY REBELLION. This busy and successful diplomacy strengthened the struggling young nation and especially increased the influence of the Federalist party. So, too, had an event that occurred the previous year. In 1794 the farmers of western Pennsylvania protested against the whiskey tax. This was an "excise" tax--an internal tax--passed a few years before to raise additional funds for the national government.

The whiskey tax angered farmers in the West because it was usual there to make grain (corn or wheat) into whiskey in order to carry it more easily across the mountains to market. Also, where specie and bank notes were in short supply, whiskey was used as a form of money. To the farmers Hamilton's excise tax on whiskey seemed to be a tax directed against them and their crops. They refused to pay the tax when the United States marshal tried to collect it, and in 1794 they staged a "rebellion." The governor of Pennsylvania thought the courts could handle the matter. But Washington, urged on by Hamilton, saw the "rebellion" as a direct attack on the authority of the government. Just as in the days of Daniel Shays, it seemed the state had become a victim of mob rule.

Fulfilling his duty under the Constitution to maintain a "republican form of government," Washington called out the militia. Fifteen thousand strong, it marched west to put down the farmers. In no mood to fight the militia, they returned to their homes. But the ringleaders were seized. Two of them were convicted of treason but were pardoned by the President, who wanted only to prove the strength of the new government. His decisive handling of this affair attracted supporters to the Federalist cause.

BOORSTIN
FUGITIVE SLAVE ACT
P. 260

The revolt against the Fugitive Slave Act. The Fugitive Slave Act of 1850 kept tempers hot in the North. It provided that state and city authorities and even plain citizens should assist in the capture and return of runaway slaves. State after state passed personal Liberty laws. These forbade state officials or private citizens to assist federal courts in enforcing the Fugitive Slave Act. The laws also tried to guarantee protection and a fair trial to runaways.

Northerners showed their defiance of the Fugitive Slave Act dramatically and effectively by expanding their efforts to help slaves escape. The "Underground Railroad" was a well-organized series of routes and stopovers (stations) leading north to Canada for runaway slaves. By 1861 this scheme had helped some 75,000 slaves escape to freedom.

BOOORSTIN
LITTLE ROCK
P. 628

The first serious incident occurred in the fall of 1957 when the Little Rock, Arkansas, school board moved to integrate its high schools. Governor Orval Faubus suddenly declared that there was a danger of violence in Little Rock and sent in the National Guard. The National Guard prevented the black children from attending school. Then a federal judge forced the National Guard to be removed. On September 23, when the black children again tried to attend school, a white mob forced them to leave.

The government intervenes. President Eisenhower hesitated to involve himself in the integration of the schools. He later said he believed that the Supreme Court decision in Brown was correct, but at the time he was silent. He thought that a President should not approve or disapprove of court decisions. Southerners, he said, should be given a chance to adjust to this great change. The process would have to go ahead slowly, Eisenhower said, because "we have got to have reason and sense and education, and a lot of other developments that go hand in hand in this process--if this process is going to have any real acceptance in the United States."

But the mob violence was too much. The President finally acted. He ordered the Arkansas National Guard into the federal service so that Governor Faubus could not use them to stop integration. Then he sent in 1000 paratroopers and opened the schools. Still the story had only begun. The paratroopers stayed, but in the fall of 1958 Governor Faubus ordered the high schools closed to prevent integration. They were closed the entire school year. Virginia also closed some schools that same year to prevent them from being integrated. The battle for integration would be long and hard.

BOORSTIN
JAMES MEREDITH
P. 673

In the fall of 1962, a black Air Force veteran, James Meredith, tried to enroll in the all-white University of Mississippi. A court ordered that he be admitted. Still, Governor Ross Barnett personally prevented him from registering. When Meredith finally did enroll, riots followed that causes two deaths and injuries to hundred. President Kennedy ordered 5000 federal troops to the scene to restore quiet. Meredith remained at the University of Mississippi--protected by federal troops.

BOORSTIN
FREEDOM RIDERS
P. 673

THE BLACK REVOLT. The pressures to do more were building rapidly. In 1961 "freedom riders, blacks and white from North and South, took buses south to protest segregation of the races in bus stations. They were greeted by riots and beatings. Their buses were burned. On May 29, 1961, Attorney General Robert Kennedy called on the Interstate Commerce Commission to ban segregation in interstate bus terminals. That was finally done in September.

BOORSTIN
INDIANS
P. 740

INDIAN POWER. Some Indians began to take violent action to call attention to their wants. During 1969 an angry group of 78 Indians seized Alcatraz Island with its deserted prison in San Francisco Bay. They demanded that it be made an Indian cultural center. Finally, they were evicted by United States marshals in 1971.

In 1972 the militant American Indian Movement occupied the offices of the BIA in Washington. They demanded all the rights and the property that they said had been guaranteed to the Indians over many past years by their treaties with the United States government. After a week of talks--and damage estimated at a half-million dollars--the Indians finally left the building.

More than 200 armed members of the American Indian Movement during 1973 took over the village of Wounded Knee on the Ogala Sioux Pine Ridge Reservation in South Dakota. They opposed the local tribal government and demanded other reforms. This town near the site of the last battle of the Indian wars--the massacre at Wounded Knee Creek in 1890 was a symbol of Indian suffering. The occupation continued for two months. The Roman Catholic church, the trading post, and other buildings were destroyed. Two Indians were killed in the shooting between the Indians and the government agents.

The Indians themselves were sharply divided. The militants at the BIA and at Wounded Knee wanted to oust from authority all Indians who did not follow their orders. Many other Indians rejected violence. They preferred to seek their rights through the courts.

BOORSTIN
COAL 1902
P. 430

THE COAL STRIKE. Hardly had TR moved into the White House when he had his first chance to show how a President should lead. The owners of the nation's anthracite (Hard coal) mines were reckless of the safety of their men. Workers were dying needlessly each year. In 1901 alone, 441 men were killed in mining accidents in the anthracite fields of Illinois, Ohio, Pennsylvania, and West Virginia.

The men had received no raise in wages in twenty years. They were paid by the weight of the coal they dug, but the companies were not weighing honestly. A man might have to dig 4000 pounds before getting credit for a ton. Miners were sometimes paid in scrip that could only be used in "company stores" which charged high prices.

By 1902 the miners could endure no more. The union leaders decided to take action. John Mitchell, then the energetic young president of the United Mine Workers, was the son of a miner who had lost his life in the mines. Mitchell himself had begun mining at age 12. His union--150,000 strong--included thousands of immigrant newcomers who spoke over a dozen languages.

The coal miners went on strike in May 1902. But the mine owners refused to deal with the union. They tried to force the miners back to work. George F. Baer, the president of the Philadelphia and Reading Coal and Iron Company, was the chief spokesman for the owners. "The rights and interests of the laboring man," he declared, "will be protected and cared for not by the labor agitators, but by the Christian men to whom God in his wisdom has given the control of the property interests of the country."

By October with winter coming on, people feared that the railroads would have to stop running and that they would freeze without coal to heat their homes. Then the President came to the rescue. No matter who owned the mines, Roosevelt insisted that nobody owned the miners. He called the mine operators and John Mitchell to the White House. When the owners refused to arbitrate, he let them know he might send the army into the mines. At last on October 13 the owners gave in and agreed to deal with the union. The miners went back to work and later won most of their demands. When the strike ended, TR had shown how, in the new age of business, it was possible for the federal government to help. He had proven himself a champion of the ordinary American. He had seen that the miners received a "square deal." That was what he wanted for all Americans.

BOORSTIN
BONUS ARMY
P.507

In the spring of 1932 thousands of unemployed veterans formed a "Bonus Army." They demanded that the full cash value of their insurance policies should be paid them by the government at once. They marched on Washington. When they arrived in the capital, of course, they could not afford to stay in hotels. So they camped in empty government buildings and on government land waiting for their bonus. President Hoover called out the army to drive them away. "What a pitiful spectacle," the Washington News observed, "is that of the great American government, mightiest in the world, chasing unarmed men, women and children with Army tanks... If the Army must be called out to make war on unarmed citizens, this is no longer America."

DAVIDSON
WHISKEY REBELLION
P.176

Finally, Hamilton proposed an excise tax on distilled liquors as another money-raising measure. Congress adopted such a tax in 1791. This measure eventually led to a rebellion in Pennsylvania that threatened the stability of the new nation.

Farmers in the Pennsylvania back country usually distilled their grain into whiskey because whiskey was less bulky to transport by wagon and brought a higher price. They actually used the whiskey as money, since no stable currency existed yet. Resentment of the excise tax grew steadily as farmers saw their profits dwindle. The farmers finally rebelled in 1794 with cries of "liberty and no excise." They refused to pay any further tax and some of them tarred and feathered revenue officials.

Although Pennsylvania's governor thought that the state could handle the situation, Alexander Hamilton saw a chance to demonstrate the power of the federal government. President Washington, taking Hamilton's advice, summoned a force of state militia. This show of federal force was overpowering, and the rebellion ended without a shot being fired. Hamilton wanted to punish the leaders, but Washington, with a cooler head, pardoned them.

Alexander Hamilton's economic program contributed to a strong start for the new government by restoring the confidence of both the foreign and domestic investors and by building a firm foundation for future economic growth. President Washington's vigorous action against the Whiskey Rebellion also strengthened the national government. It demonstrated the government's authority to act within the borders of a state and clearly showed that the new government would act decisively in times of crisis.

DAVIDSON
FUGITIVE SLAVE LAW
P. 308

To Southerners the new Fugitive Slave Law, part of the Compromise of 1850, represented only what was due them. They claimed that the Constitution permitted them to hold slaves as property and that fugitive slaves were either runaways or stolen property and should be returned.

But many northerners bitterly resented certain provisions of the Fugitive Slave Law. For example, a person accused of being a fugitive slave had to stand trial before a special commissioner, not a judge. No jury heard the case, and the accused could not even testify in his or her own behalf. Furthermore, the commissioner received a $10 fee if he sent the accused fugitive back to slavery and only $5 if he freed the person. This, angry northerners pointed out, amounted to little less than a bribe to insure that the accused was declared a runaway slave. Finally, the law required all citizens to assist in capturing a fugitive slave.

DAVIDSON
FORCE ACTS
P. 356

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

In 1870 and 1871 Congress passed the Force Act and Ku Klux Klan Act, outlawing the use of force to prevent people from voting, and authorized President Grant to use federal troops to enforce the laws. Under such pressure the Klan's activities diminished, but the threat of violence lingered. One by one, the southern states voted out the Radical Republican governments and replaced them with conservative ones. By 1876 only Louisiana, Florida, and South Carolina retained their Radical governments.

DAVIDSON
BLEEDING KANSAS
P. 310

Northerners promptly claimed the election had been stolen. They became even more incensed when the territorial legislature passed harsh proslavery laws. One law made it a crime to declare slavery illegal in Kansas; another ordered the death penalty for anyone who helped an escaped slave. In response to these actions antislavery settlers in Kansas refused to recognize the authority of the territorial government and established a rival free-state government at Lawrence, Kansas.

Chaos soon reigned throughout the territory with two separate governments proclaiming authority and armed bands roaming the countryside. Finally, in May 1856 three events made the Kansas issue the focus of national attention. On May 21 a mob of Missourians acting as a sheriff's posse charged into Lawrence, looted and burned several houses, threw two printing presses into the river and bombarded the Free State with cannon.

On May 22 Senator Charles Sumner of Massachusetts delivered a speech denouncing the violence in Kansas. Sumner charged that slave owners, including some of his colleagues in the Senate, were responsible. The next day Congressman Preston Brooks of South Carolina, a cousin of one of South Carolina's senators, attacked Sumner with a cane as he sat at his Senate desk. The injured Massachusetts senator was unable to resume his duties in the Senate for three years and he never fully recovered.

On the night of May 24 a little known Kansas anti-slavery agitator named John Brown took vengeance for the Lawrence attack into his own hands. Brown and a group of followers massacred five southern men and boys at a proslavery settlement at Pottawatomie Creek, Kansas, even though the victims had nothing to do with the Lawrence raid.

The three violent events, following one another so closely, demonstrated how badly the Compromise of 1850 had failed. One of its major elements, the Fugitive Slave Law, had outraged the North. The question of extending slavery to the territories, which the compromise was supposed to settled, had been raised more violently than ever on the battleground of "Bleeding Kansas."

DAVIDSON
COAL STRIKE OF 1902
P. 466

Roosevelt was not an enemy of big business. He accepted large businesses as an important part of the modern economy and thought that many combinations made good economic sense. However, the President did move against industrialists when he thought they acted irresponsibly, as in the 1902 strike by anthracite coal miners in Pennsylvania. The union asked for a shorter working day and better wages, but the coal operators flatly refused to negotiate.

Summer passed as coal supplies around the country dwindled. Schools and hospitals began to run out. Even after the union agreed to let an arbitrator settle the issues, the operators refused to negotiate. The arrogant attitude of the owners outraged both the President and the public.

The situation was ready-made for Roosevelt's drive to establish the government's right to control harmful business practices. He threatened to send troops in to run the mines if the coal owners refused to negotiate with the union. Other Presidents had used troops in labor disputes, but in support of employers, not workers. The coal mine operators backed down, and Roosevelt was hailed as a champion of working people.

In another effort to increase government supervision of business practices Roosevelt convinced Congress to establish the Department of Commerce and Labor in 1903. The department's first job was to assemble facts about American business. Within the department, the Bureau of Corporations publicized information about industry. Roosevelt believed that if the activities of an industry were open to public scrutiny, the business would stay honest.

In expanding government regulation of business, Roosevelt encountered strong opposition within the Republican party. "Old guard" Republicans traditionally represented business interests. These politicians believed that government interference would weaken the free enterprise system. Thus Roosevelt moved somewhat cautiously in his first years as President, a job he had inherited rather than won on his own.

**DAVIDSON
1919 STEEL STRIKE
P. 521**

The first serious postwar confrontation between labor and management occurred in the steel industry. In 1892 the Homestead strike had temporarily ended attempts to unionize the steel industry. After the war, the American Federation of Labor decided to launch a second organizing effort.

In September 1919 a newly formed steel worker's union demanded higher wages, one day's rest out of seven and an end to the 12 hour work day. When steel mill owners refused to negotiate, the union called a strike. Within a week 365,000 workers across the country had walked out. When violence erupted, local police and state militia helped steel companies break the picket lines. Companies hired strike breakers to replace the union workers. After 20 deaths and the loss of $100 million in wages, the union called off the strike on January 9, 1920. It had won no concessions.

**DAVIDSON
JAMES MEREDITH
P. 671**

Attorney General Robert Kennedy dealt firmly with violations of civil rights. In 1961 he sent federal troops to Alabama to protect blacks trying to integrate buses and trains. Robert Kennedy personally supervised the case of James Meredith, a black Air Force veteran who attempted to enroll at the all-white University of Mississippi. When Meredith registered for classes in 1962, rioting erupted and the President sent federal marshals to the campus to back the National Guard. Several hundred soldiers remained there until Meredith graduated.

In Alabama, George Wallace gained national attention by temporarily detaining federal marshals as they escorted black student Autherine Lucy to the formerly all-white University of Alabama. Lucy also continued her education with the protection of the National Guard.

DAVIDSON
WOUNDED KNEE
P. 679

A major confrontation between AIM members and federal authorities occurred at Wounded Knee, South Dakota, site of a massacre of Indians by the United States Army in 1890. In March 1973 AIM members seized the trading post at Wounded Knee. The government responded by surrounding the area with federal law officers. The militants' position was weakened when other Native Americans did not support their demands, and they were forced to leave Wounded Knee.

DAVIDSON
BONUS ARMY
P. 556

As the cry for government action increased, jobless veterans took to the road to dramatize their demands. After the war Congress had voted veterans a bonus to be paid in 1941. In 1931 Congress voted to let veterans borrow up to 50 percent of the value of their bonuses, but President Hoover vetoed the bill.

In protest a group of veterans from Oregon set out on a widely publicized journey to Washington, D. C., to demand their bonuses immediately. As they traveled eastward, hundreds and then thousands of other veterans joined them. About 17,000 reached the capital city in the spring of 1932. Most camped in makeshift tents or shacks on the Anacostia Flats, a swampy area near the Potomac River. Some set up camp in abandoned warehouses and government buildings nearby. Wives and children joined many of the veterans.

The House of Representatives voted to give the veterans their bonuses immediately but the Senate overwhelmingly rejected the bill. Discouraged, some of the "bonus marchers" returned home but thousands decided to stay in Washington. They vowed to camp there until the government gave them their money.

The presence of such a large group of protestors did little to improve the image of the Hoover administration. Despite the fears of Hoover and his advisers, the veterans were largely peaceful. Much of the calm could be attributed to the tireless actions of the Washington Police Chief Pelham Glassford, a former brigadier general. Some of the veterans had served under Glassford in the war, and he still considered them "his boys." Daily he rode through the bonus camp on his motorcycle, helping people locate food, shelter and medicine. When food ran out, he spent his own money to buy more.

President Hoover refused to meet with the march leaders. When a fight broke out between marchers and local police, the President ordered the army to tear down the veterans' camp. Under the command of General Douglas MacArthur, cavalry troops used tear gas to clear out the veterans and their families. Newspaper and magazine photos and movie newsreels of the event shocked the public. The scene convinced many that the Hoover administration was incapable of handling the spreading misery of the depression.

JORDON
WHISKEY REBELLION
P. 205

So Hamilton suggested that an excise (sales tax) be levied on every gallon of whiskey that was made and sold.

Why on whiskey? The reason was political. Most whiskey producers were small frontier farmers...Farmers in western Pennsylvania refused to pay. They beat up federal marshals in Pittsburgh and even threatened to secede from the Union.

Hamilton, however, was not upset. He looked upon the Whiskey Rebellion as an opportunity for the federal government to show that it could enforce the law without help from the states, even along the western frontier. Accordingly, some 15,000 militia were called up. Accompanied by Hamilton himself in uniform, the federal troops hiked over the Allegenies and scattered the rebels without the loss of a single life.

JORDON
FUGITIVE SLAVE LAW
P. 319

The Fugitive Slave Law of 1850, part of the Compromise of that year, provided for the recovery of slaves who ran away to free states. Slaveholders, or their hired agents, could seize their runaway slaves in any Northern state. They could demand assistance from federal marshals. A slaveholder could then go before a federal judge to make a legal claim. If the judge decided in the slaveholder's favor, the slave could be taken south.

JORDON
BLEEDING KANSAS
P. 322

SETTLER AGAINST SETTLER. In those days, Kansas was very much a frontier society. Violence and lawlessness were common. Also, most of the settlers were young, single men. The absence of women and families made them quick to draw their knives and pistols.

Soon, major incidents of violence broke out. A large group of tough proslavery men rode into Lawrence, Kansas, in search of several leading Free-Soilers. The proslavery legislature had indicted those Free-Soilers for treason, so the raiders of Lawrence felt they had legal backing. They burned the only hotel in the tiny town, destroyed several homes, and smashed the presses of a new Free-Soil newspaper. When the Northern newspapers learned about the raid, they called it the "Sack of Lawrence" and exaggerated every detail.

In Kansas, a single minded abolitionist decided on revenge. John Brown gathered four of his sons and two other followers. In May 1856 they rode into the small proslavery settlement at Pottawatomie Creek, dragged five men out of their homes, and killed them. Brown claimed that he had God's support for this murderous action.

JORDON
1877 RAILROAD
P. 439

THE GREAT STRIKE. Early in 1877 the New York Commercial and Financial Chronicle told its readers: "Labor is under control for the first time since the war." A few months later, newspapers throughout the country were carrying such headlines as CITY IN POSSESSION OF COMMUNISTS. What had happened? The first nation-wide strike in U.S. history had broken out.

THE CAUSE. The strike was begun by workers for the Baltimore and Ohio Railroad in West Virginia. Ever since the depression of 1873, the railroad industry had been in trouble. Many lines had gone bankrupt. In an effort to lower costs and still maintain annual dividends of 8-10 percent, which stockholders expected, railroad management had cut wage rates 35 percent in three years. In addition, the railroads had lengthened the working day to fifteen to eighteen hours. Also, trains were double-headed, which meant that a crew had to handle twice as many cars as before.

Then on July 11, the Baltimore and Ohio Railroad announced yet another pay cut. It would bring a fireman's wages for example, down to $6 for a four-day week. On July 16, when the new scale went into effect, forty firemen and brakemen quit their jobs in protest. They were replaced at once, and the freight trains started down the line. But when they reached Martinsburg, West Virginia, sympathetic trainmen surrounded the railroad depot. No trains would leave, they said, until wages were restored to their original level. The wives and mothers of the trainmen, who joined the demonstration, agreed. "Better to starve outright," said one of them, "than to die by slow starvation."

THE REACTION. The Baltimore and Ohio immediately asked the governor to request federal troops. In the meantime, county militia were sent to Pittsburgh, where a sympathy strike had broken out. But instead of dispersing the strikers, the militia went over to their side. Only when federal troops arrived was the demonstration broken up, at a cost of twenty-six strikers killed and hundreds wounded. Enraged by this bloodshed, some 20,000 persons, including thousands of workers from Pittsburgh's steel mills and coal mines, attacked the federal troops and drove them out of the city. Then they began to destroy railroad property.

Similar strikes flared up all along the nation's railroad lines. Everywhere, federal troops were used against peaceful strikers and rioters alike. Sometimes state militia supported the strikers. At other times, the state militia fought alongside the federal forces.

JORDON
PULLMAN STRIKE
P.443

Another example of government support of industry took place in 1894. When the 1893 depression hit, the Pullman Company cut wages by 24 to 40 percent. Rents and prices in the town of Pullman, however, remained the same. As a result, many workers found themselves deep in debt. So they sent a committee to the company management asking that the wage cuts be restored. The company replied by firing the committee members. The workers struck and asked the American Railway Union for help.

Debs tried several times to arbitrate the dispute, but the Pullman Company refused to negotiate. So the American Railway Union declared a boycott of Pullman cars. ARU members cut the cars out from trains and put them on sidetracks. When these men were fired, other members of the ARU quit in protest. Within four days, 125,000 railroad workers were out on strike, and traffic between Chicago and the West Coast was practically at a standstill.

At this point, the General Managers Association, an organization of twenty-four of the nation's biggest railroads, decided to step in.

First, the managers brought in strikebreakers. Then they asked U.S. Attorney General Richard Olney, who had been a railroad lawyer for many years, for help. Olney convinced President Cleveland to send in federal troops on the grounds of guaranteeing the delivery of mail. (As a matter of fact, the ARU had not interfered with mail trains at all, and mail was being delivered without interruption.)

Olney also appointed Edwin Walker, another railroad lawyer, as special attorney in Chicago. Walker promptly issued an injunction, that is a court order prohibiting all strike activity against the railroads. The argument was that railroads were not a private business but "a public highway." If workers quit as a group, they were interfering with interstate commerce. Walker also swore in almost 3600 special deputies, which brought the total or armed troops in Chicago to 14,000.

The combination of federal troops and the injunction was too much for the union. The boycott collapsed, while Debs was sentenced to six months in jail for trying to keep the strike going in spite of the court order. Soon after, the strike ended and the American Railway Union fell apart.

JORDON
COAL STRIKE OF 1902
P. 529

INCREASING FEDERAL POWER. There was another aspect to Roosevelt's political behavior. It was based on a knowledge of American history and a vision of national unity. Americans had filled out a continent and built an industrial empire. But they had not in Roosevelt's opinion, developed the political tools for managing what they had created. "A simple and poor society can exist as a democracy on the basis of sheer individualism. But a rich and complex society cannot so exist." In other words in the 1900's, according to Roosevelt, it was necessary for the federal government to manage certain areas of society so the nation could develop in an orderly manner.

MEDIATING A COAL STRIKE. One example of Roosevelt's approach was his handling of a coal strike in 1902. Coal miners in Pennsylvania struck for higher wages, an eight-hour day, and the right to organize a union. The mine operators refused to bargain. They even refused to meet with the labor leaders at the White House. George Baer a mine owner and president of the Reading Railroad, said it was his "religious duty" to defeat the strikers. "The rights and interests of the laboring men will be protected and cared for--not by labor agitators, but by Christian men to whom God in his infinite wisdom had given control of the property interests of the country."

Roosevelt threatened to seize the mines and have the army run them. Finally, he decided to appoint a commission to make recommendations for settling the strike.

The mine operators finally agreed to arbitration. The settlement was a compromise. The workers received a 10 percent pay hike and a nine-hour day. But they did not obtain a closed shop, that is an agreement under which operators will not hire anyone who does not belong to the union. In addition, the workers agreed not to strike again for three years.

More important than the actual settlement however, was the establishment of a new principle. In the past, presidents had sent in federal troops only to protect private property or to keep such services as the United States mail going. Now, Roosevelt was saying that the federal government could intervene in a strike if the public welfare was involved. And since much of the nation used Pennsylvania coal for heating, there was no question but that the welfare of the public was involved. In some northern cities, riots even broke out as people found themselves facing winter with empty coal bins. In addition, Roosevelt was emphasizing the Progressive belief that disputes should be settled in an orderly way with the help of experts.

JORDON
STEEL STRIKE 1919
P.581

STEEL MILLS: A TWENTY-FOUR HOUR WORKDAY. Public opinion had been outraged by the Boston police strike. It was equally opposed to the steel strike that began in September 1919.

Most steel workers put in seven, twelve-hour days every week in hot and noisy foundries. Since steel furnaces must operate around the clock, there were two shifts. Once every two weeks, a steel worker "swung" from the day shift to the night shift. This "swing shift" meant that he had to work an incredible twenty-four hours! And that was at labor as hard, uncomfortable, and dangerous as any in American industry.

The steel industry was not unionized, although more than twenty unions belonging to the American Federation of Labor wanted to represent various occupations in the mills. This unwieldy group formed an organizing committee under William Z. Foster, but its efforts were badly coordinated. The AFL unions were jealous of one another, and Foster offended and frightened many with his radicalism. He later joined the Communist party and was its presidential candidate in 1924, 1928 and 1932.

The steel strike was broken in January 1920, after eighteen workers had been killed by a combination of U.S. Steel security police, state militia, and federal troops. At first people in general were relieved that another threat by "un-American elements" had been turned back. Then in 1923, a Protestant interfaith committee published a report on working conditions in the mills. The report shocked the public, and the steel companies agreed to establish an eight-hour day. But steel workers remained organized.

JORDON
LITTLE ROCK
P. 720

RESISTING SCHOOL INTEGRATION. Governor Orval E. Faubus of Arkansas was seeking a third term. He faced several difficulties. The state had a two-term tradition, and the governor had offended various groups of raising taxes and allowing utilities and railroads to increase their rates. He needed a strong campaign issue.

The city of Little Rock had carefully worked out a plan for integrating its schools over a seven year period. In the fall of 1957, the plan called for nine black students to be enrolled with 2000 white students in the city's Central High School. Suddenly, the night before classes were scheduled to begin, Governor Faubus called out the National Guard and stationed it around the school. The next day, soldiers with fixed bayonets turned the nine black youngsters away. Several days later, a federal court ordered the guardsmen removed. But when the black students again tried to go to class, a white mob created so much turmoil that they were forced to leave.

Faced with a virtual revolt, President Eisenhower did not hesitate. As he told the nation, "Mob rule cannot be allowed to override the decisions of our courts." He promptly ordered 1000 paratroopers of the 101st Airborne Division into Little Rock to uphold the law. This was the first time since Reconstruction that the power of the federal government was used to protect blacks in the South. For a good measure, Eisenhower also federalized the Arkansas National Guard, thus taking it out of the governor's control.

The nine blacks were admitted to Central High School. Most of the federal troops were withdrawn in November, although a few remained until the end of the school year. In 1958 Governor Faubus who had won his campaign for reelection, closed the school. After a legal battle it reopened in 1959 with only three black students enrolled.

JORDON
FREEDOM RIDERS
P. 746

FREEDOM RIDES. In May of the following year, 1961, another direct but non-violent technique was used. It was sponsored by the Congress of Racial Equality (CORE) and it was called a freedom ride. A group of blacks and whites rode buses throughout the Deep South to see whether the 1950 Supreme Court decision outlawing segregation in interstate travel was being obeyed. In Alabama, mobs beat many of the freedom riders and firebombed one of the buses. The local police did little. When additional violence threatened, Attorney General Robert Kennedy sent 400 federal marshals into Montgomery. He then asked the Interstate Commerce Commission to order interstate trains, buses, airplanes, train depots, bus stations, and airports integrated. Within months, blacks could travel anywhere in the country without seeing "White" or "Colored" signs in waiting rooms.

JORDON
JAMES MEREDITH
P.747

CONFRONTATIONS AT UNIVERSITIES. In 1962 a federal court ordered the University of Mississippi to admit James H. Meredith, a qualified black Air Force veteran. Governor Ross R. Barnett refused to allow Meredith to register. Standing at the school door, Barnett cited the doctrine of interposition, that is, putting himself between the federal government and the people of Mississippi. He announced that the state's laws on segregation were superior to federal law. Attorney General Robert Kennedy than sent federal marshals to the campus and rioting broke out.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Marshals were forbidden to fire their guns. Their only weapon was tear gas. Most of the rioters were not students but members of the Ku Klux Klan and the National States' Rights Party from other southern states. They were armed with grenades, iron bars, bricks and rifles. Two white spectators were killed, and more than a third of the marshals were injured. Finally, President Kennedy sent in federal troops to restore order. He also federalized the Mississippi National Guard.

The next day, Meredith registered for classes. He planned to major in political science.

In June of the following year, 1963, another university confrontation occurred, this time at the University of Alabama. A federal court ordered the school to admit two blacks, Vivian J. Malone and Jimmy A. Hood, to its summer session. Governor George Wallace, like Governor Barnett, stood in the doorway as the two students and their escort of federal marshals approached. But after being told that the National Guard had been federalized, the governor walked away.

JORDON
BONUS ARMY
P. 601

THE BONUS ARMY. On July 28, 1932, American soldiers, wearing gas masks holding fixed bayonets, and backed by cavalry and tanks, marched from Washington, D.C., to Anacostia Flats, an open field at the outskirts of the capital. The troops were led by Army Chief of Staff Douglas MacArthur and his aide, Major Dwight D. Eisenhower. Firing tear gas canisters and wielding their bayonets and cavalry sabers, the soldiers soon cleared out those camping on the Flats and set fire to their shacks. In the course of the operation, more than 1000 persons were gassed, including an eleven month old baby who died and an eight-year old boy who was partially blinded.

It was a sad end for a group of World War I veterans who called themselves the Bonus Expeditionary Force. The name was a reminder that fifteen years earlier, they had served in the American Expeditionary Force that sailed to France. In 1924 Congress had voted veterans a cash bonus, to be paid in 1945. In 1931 veterans were allowed to borrow money against the bonus. The bonus was to make up for the wages the men had missed by serving in the army at only thirty dollars a month while others back home worked at high paying wartime jobs. The next year, in desperate financial straits, the veterans asked for full payment of what was due, an average of $500 to each man. Representative Wright Patman introduced such a bill.

Led by William Waters, an unemployed cannery worker, the first Bonus Marchers left Oregon and started across the country to lobby for passage of the Patman Bill. Others followed. By June, about 17,000 veterans, some with wives and children, had arrived in the nation's capital and were camped on Anacostia Flats. On Jun 17 the Senate voted down the Patman bill. The government then offered the veterans money for transportation home. The money was to be deducted from their bonuses when paid. Most of the veterans agreed to leave. But about 2000 without jobs and without homes, remained and were driven away on July 28.

TODD
WHISKEY REBELLION
P. 227

THE WHISKY Rebellion. **(Please note the mispelling of whiskey)** In a fourth proposal, Hamilton urged Congress to levy an excise tax on distilled liquors. All distillers would have to pay this tax on every gallon (3.8 liters) of liquor they produced and sold.

Congress passed the tax. For reasons that became clear when you picture the country as it was in the 1790's, the tax fell most heavily on the people living on the frontier.

In the 1790's the frontier was almost totally isolated from the settled areas along the Atlantic coast. Only the roughest of trails--for the most part the old Indian trails--connected the frontier with the eastern seaboard. As a result, frontier farmers could not transport their corn to markets in the settled areas. This was a major problem, for corn was the most important crop of the frontier farmers. Fortunately, there was an easy solution to the problem. The farmers built stills and converted the corn into whisky. Then they load the jugs and kegs of whisky on the backs of mules and drove the mules eastward to the markets. Whisky was the major source of cash for the frontier farmers and it was whisky that was now being taxed by the federal government.

The freedom-loving frontier setters refused to pay the tax. In 1794 federal marshalls(**Again, please note misspelling**) tried to enforce the law, but armed groups of farmers drove them away. The governor of Pennsylvania at first refused to call out the militia to crush the uprising. In this so-called "Whisky Rebellion," frontier farmers challenged the power of the federal government.

At Hamilton's urging, President Washington called out the militia from neighboring states. The rebellion melted away when 15,000 militia men were sent to the scene. No lives were lost, but the federal government had demonstrated its strength.

TODD
BLEEDING KANSAS
P.401

BLEEDING KANSAS. While congress argued, violence raged in what people called "Bleeding Kansas." Northerners and southerners alike rushed weapons into the territory. An armed proslavery group burned part of the town of Lawrence, a center of the antislavery settlers. In revenge, a fanatical white abolitionist, John Brown, gathered an armed group, including his own sons, and murdered five unarmed proslavery men. The fighting over slavery and over disputed land claims took the lives of more than 200 men and women before federal troops moved in to restore order.

TODD
FORCE ACTS
P. 459

Congress tried to end the lawlessness by passing a series of Military Enforcement Acts, sometimes called the Force Acts (1870-71). These acts gave the President power to use federal military forces to control the secret societies, to call upon the state militia when necessary and to suspend the writ of habeas corpus. They also provided for federal supervision of southern elections.

To many white southerners, the Force Acts seemed unduly harsh. Yet compared with the treatment of the losers in the civil wars elsewhere, the former Confederates were not severely punished. There were never more than 25,000 federal troops in the occupied states after the war. No political leader was executed, few were imprisoned, and President Johnson made liberal use of his pardoning power. Jefferson Davis for example, was released from prison within two years. Except for the loss of slaves, property was seldom seized by the federal government as punishment for what many northerners regarded as treason.

The Force Acts, the withdrawal of many southerners from the secret societies and finally the Amnesty Act virtually ended the power of the Ku Klux Klan and other such groups at that time. Most white southerners began to vote again , and white southern leaders reemerged.

TODD
1877 RAILROAD
P. 543

In the most serious labor disputes, governors sent the state militia to the scene, which was to the employers' advantage. Whenever they sent the militia, the governors argued that the troops were needed to protect property, prevent violence and maintain order. Since the governors were sworn to uphold law and order, this seemed reasonable. On the other hand, the arrival of the state militia often made it impossible for the workers to continue to strike.

In the last quarter of the 1800's, the Presidents of the United States in general followed the example of the state governors in ordering troops to a scene of trouble. Thus during a series of railroad strikes in Pennsylvania and Maryland in 1877, when state troops could not restore order, President Hayes sent federal soldiers to keep the trains running. The strikes collapsed.

TODD
PULLMAN
P.544

Federal troops also stepped in near Chicago in 1894 when a strike was called against the Pullman Palace Car Company by the American Railway Union led by Eugene V. Debs. The strike was supported by railway workers around Chicago and elsewhere, who refused to handle trains that included Pullman cars. When Governor Altgeld of Illinois refused to call out the state militia or ask for federal help, President Cleveland sent federal troops anyway. Cleveland declared that such

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

action was justified in order to guarantee mail delivery, although mail trains were in fact running and the mails were being delivered. Organized labor resented such use of federal troops.

THE COURTS SUPPORT INDUSTRY. In the late 1800's, the courts generally sided with management. For example, during the Pullman strike, the railroad owners asked a federal court in Chicago to issue an injunction or court order, forbidding Debs and other labor leaders to continue the strike. The court issued the injunction. It claimed that the strikers had entered into "a conspiracy in restraint of trade" and were therefore violating the Sherman Anti-trust Act of 1890, which declared such conspiracies illegal.

TODD
FREEDOM RIDERS
P. 947

"Freedom rides" and "freedom marches" by whites and blacks also dramatized the struggle for civil rights. In 1963 A Philip Randolph, a veteran black trade union leader, organized a march on Washington.

TODD
LITTLE ROCK
P. 878

CONGRESS FINALLY ACTS. Efforts by both white and blacks to avoid violence were only partially successful. Attempts at school integration as the Supreme Court had directed in 1954 led to violence in a number of communities. In 1957 President Eisenhower sent federal troops to Little Rock, Arkansas, to maintain order when several black students tried to enter the all-white high school.

TODD
INDIANS
P. 956

VIOLENCE The growing awareness of Indian problems was quickened by militant Indian action. One group of Indians took over Alcatraz Island, a former Federal prison in California to dramatize their demands.

The American Indian Movement (AIM) was launched by young urban Indian leaders in the late 1960's. In the fall of 1972, some 500 members of AIM banded together, calling themselves "The Trail of Broken Treaties." They marched on Washington, D.C., occupied the Bureau of Indian Affairs, and did some $2 million in damage. They finally received official promises that the government would pay attention to their complaints.

In February 1973, members of AIM seized the trading post and church at the Sioux Pine Reservation in Wounded Knee, South Dakota. This was the village where in 1890 United States cavalry units had brutually massacred more than 200 Indians. For 71 days heavily armed Indians and United States marshals grimly confronted each other over the barricades that separated them. In the end, after the government promised to consider their demands, the Indians surrendered.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Brauner, Carl. John F. Kennedy and the Second Reconstruction New York: Columbia University Press. 1971.

Berman, Ed. Labor Disputes and the Presidents. New York: Columbia University, 1924.

Calhoun, Frederick. The Lawmen, U.S. Marshals and their Deputies 1789-1989. Washington, D.C. : Smithsonian Press, 1990.

Cantwell, Bert."The U.S. Marshal in Kansas." Masters Thesis, Wichita State University, 1980.

Coakley, Robert. The Role of Federal Military Forces in Domestic Disorders 1789-1878. Washington, D.C.: Center of Military History, Department of the Army, 1988.

Covert, Robert. "Content Analysis: Analysis of Work Samples and other Written Documents":Charlottesville: UVA, 1977. Photocopied.

Dry, Murray. "Federalism in the Constitution: The Founder's Design, Constitutional Commentary, Vol. 4 233 (1987).

Engdahl, David. "Soldiers, Riots and Revolution: The Law and History of Military Troops in Civil Disorders". Iowa Law Review 1 (1971).

Fitzgerald, Frances. America Revised, History Schoolbooks in the Twentieth Century. Boston: Little Brown and Co., 1979.

Gagnon, Paul. Democracy's Half-Told Story. Washington, D.C.: American Federation of Teachers, 1989.

Gagnon, Paul. Interview by author, 9 August 1990, Harvard.

Garanty, John. Trends in Content Analysis. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1959.

Garcia, Jesus and Armstrong, David. "Textbook Evaluation:A Simple Procedure for Identifying Treatment of Selected Groups" Social Studies, (Jan/Feb. 1979).

Garcia, Jesus. "The White Ethnic Experience in Selected Secondary U.S. History Textbooks". Social Studies,(July/Aug 1986): 169-175.

Garcia, Jesus and Tanner, David. "The Portrayal of Black Americans in U.S. History Textbooks". Social Studies,(Sept./Oct., 1985): 200-204.

Hamilton, Alexander, James Madison and John Jay. The Federalist Papers New York: Clinton Rossiter, reprint New York New American Library, Mentor Books, 1961.

Jackson, Kenneth, chair. Building A History Curriculum. Bradley Commission on History in the Schools: Ed. Excellence Network, 1988.

"Honored in the Breech: Presidential Authority to Execute the Laws with Military Force," 83 Yale Law Journal 130 (1973).

Horne, Gerald. Thinking and Rethinking U.S. History. New York: Council on Interracial Books for Children, 1988.

Kammen,Michael. "Values, Beliefs, Political Ideas and Institutions". History Matters, Westlake, Ohio: Bradley Commission on History in Schools, (October 1989).

Kash, Reis. "The Causes of Wounded Knee". Masters Thesis, Wichita State University, 1980.

Kelly, Michael. "Controversy and Social Studies Textbooks" Social Studies.(March/April 1981): 61-64.

Ketner, Kathy. "New U.S. History Texts, Good News and Bad, " Social Education (January 1986):

Kirby, Darrell, and Julian, Nancy. "Treatment of Women in High School U.S. History Textbooks". Social Studies. (Sept/Oct. 1981): 203-207.

Lavacco, John, Vice President of Holt Rinehart and Winston Interview by author, 13 November 1990.

Marcus, Maeva. Historian of the Supreme Court. Interview by author, 25 June 1990. Richmond.

Moore, Robert. Reconstruction: The Promise and Betrayal of Democracy.New York: Council on Interracial Books for Children, 1983.

NEA Checklist for Selecting and Evaluating U.S. History Textbooks. Washington, D.C: NEA: 1973.

O'Neill, John. "Social Studies: Changing A Course in A Field Adrift." Update (Nov 1989).

O'Neill, Patrick. "The North American Indian in Contemporary History and Social Studies Textbooks" Journal of American Indian Education. (May 1987): 22-28.

Padover, Saul. The Living U.S. Constitution. New York: New American Library, 1983.

Patrick, John. Liberty and Order in Constitutional Government: Ideas and Issues in Federalists Papers. Richmond: Jefferson Association, 1989.

Presser,Stephen. Law and American History. Minnesota: West Publishing, 1982.

Ravitch, Diane and C.E. Finn, Jr. What Do Our 17 Year Olds Know?. New York: Harper and Row. 1987.

Reichley, M.S. "Federal Military Intervention in Civil Disturbances." Ph.D. Diss., Georgetown University, 1939.

Rich, Bernard. *The Presidents and Civil Disorders.* Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institution, 1941.

"Riot Control and the Use of Federal Troops," 81 *Harvard Law Review* 638 (1968) Sewall, Gilbert. "American History Textbooks: Where Do We Go From Here?". *Phi Delta Kappan,* (April 1988):555-558.

Sewall, Gilbert. "American History Textbooks, Where Do We Go From Here?" *Phi Delta Kappan*, 1988.

Sewall, Gilbert, Editor. *Social Studies Review*, New York: Center for Educational Studies, No. 2,(Fall 1989).

Slaughter, Thomas. *The Whiskey Rebellion.* New York: Oxford University Press, 1986.

Turner, Richard. "Black History in Selected American History Textbooks" *Educational Leadership* Vol. 30 No. 3, (Feb. 1973): 444-449.

Tyson-Bernstein, Harriet. *A Conspiracy of Good Intentions*. Washington, D.C.:Council for Basic Education, 1988.

Tyson-Berstein, Harriet. "Nineteenth Century Policies for 21st Century Practice: The Textbook Dilemma," *Educational Policy* 3 (June 1989).

Tyson-Berstein, Harriet. "Why Students Aren't Learning Much from Textbooks, " *Educational Leadership* (Nov 1989).

University of Colorado Law Revision Center. "A Comprehensive Study of the Use of Military Troops in Civil Disorders with Proposals for Legislative Reform," 43 *University of Colorado Law Review* 1972.

U.S. Congress. Senate. 1922. *Federal Aid in Domestic Disturbances 1903-1922,* by F.T. Wilson. 67th Congress 2d. sess., S. Doc. 263.

Wiecek, William. *The Guarantee Clause of the U.S. Constitution*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.